Alfred Rosenberg

The Myth of the Twentieth Century

THE MYTH
of the
TWENTIETH CENTURY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/mythoftwentiethc0000rose

Alfred Rosenberg

THE MYTH of the TWENTIETH CENTURY

AN EVALUATION
OF THE SPIRITUAL-INTELLECTUAL
CONFRONTATIONS OF OUR AGE

by Alfred Rosenberg

This address is only for those who have already found its message in their own lives, or at least long for it in their hearts.

—MEISTER ECKEHART

1982

THE NOONTIDE PRESS

THE MYTH OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

English translation by Vivian Bird
from the German **Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts**

Translation ©1982 by The Noontide Press

ISBN 0-911038-47-7

Library of Congress Catalog number: 82-60770

Printed in the United State of America

The Noontide Press, Publishers
Post Office Box 1248
Torrance, California 90505

First English edition

IN MEMORY OF THE TWO MILLION GERMAN HEROES WHO FELL IN THE (FIRST) WORLD WAR FOR A GERMAN LIFE AND A GERMAN REICH OF HONOR AND FREEDOM.

Preface

ALFRED ROSENBERG was born on the twelfth day of January, 1893 and was hanged at Nuremberg at 1:49 A.M. on the morning of 16 October 1946. He was the fourth man of the ten on whom Master-Sergeant John C. Woods performed his grisly task as hangman on that cold, black night.

Adolf Hitler had died by his own hand on 30 April, 1945 as the Russian army closed inexorably around the last redoubt of the *Reichskanzlei* bunker. As a captive of the Russians, it is unlikely that he would ever have been brought to any kind of trial—even such as the Nuremberg proceedings. Like Sultan Bayazid in the hands of Timur, or Emelyan Pugachev at the mercy of that enlightened monarch, Catherine the Great, Hitler would probably have ended in an iron cage, suspended from the Kremlin walls and reduced, no doubt, to a mindless vegetable by the inquisitors who had learned their trade so well in the Lubianka cellars. And such was the prevailing mood of the times, even in the Western democracies, that it is doubtful that any voices would have been heard protesting.

Heinrich Himmler, too, had poisoned himself and Dr. Paul Josef Goebbels, his wife and their six children had perished in the same manner on the day following the death of Hitler and Eva Braun. Martin Bormann had disappeared. He was nevertheless sentenced to death *in absentia*—a procedure unknown to British or American jurisprudence—at

Nuremberg. It seems most likely now that Bormann perished in the streets of Berlin in an attempt to escape and that his body was simply blown to bits by some chance high-explosive shell.

Then there was the *Reich Marschall*, Hermann Goering, jovial, ebullient, *bon vivant*, art lover, commander of the Richthofen squardon in World War I. Goering was probably the most charismatic figure in the National Socialist hierachy after Hitler himself. He was deputy Führer until the last few days and always the unquestioned number-two man in the Reich. At Nuremberg, his courage and wit frequently discomfited the duller minds of the prosecuting team and, at the end, less than two hours before his scheduled hanging, he was to cheat the eager hangman with a cyanide capsule he had managed to secrete on his person.

The sentiments of those who thus escaped the victor's vengeance were no doubt those of Brutus at Philippi—

Thou seest the world, Volumnius, how it goes.
Our enemies have beat us to the pit.
It is more worthy to leap in ourselves
Than tarry till they push us.

Thus of the twenty-two men indicted before the International Military Tribunal (IMT) at Nuremberg, one had never been present and one took his own life before the sentence of death could be carried out. Of the remaining twenty, three were acquitted of the charges brought against them, Hjalmar Schacht, Franz von Papen and Hans Fritzsche.

It is not my purpose in this brief introduction to discuss the Nuremberg trials in any great detail, nor yet the public rationale for them. At the time they were arranged for and conducted, I was still a serving officer in the Royal Air Force of Great Britain and had spent some six years fighting the Germans and Japanese. Nevertheless, the whole concept of trying the leaders of a defeated enemy nation for crimes which were only defined retroactively (*ex post facto* "law") in a court in which the prosecution and the judicial bench belonged to the same party, where normal rules of evidence were suspended in advance and where the *tu quoque* defense ("you did the same thing") was disallowed, disturbed and distressed me. I had been raised to believe in the impeccable majesty and justice of British law and, indeed, with some naivete perhaps, in its superiority over that of all other nations.

It did not help to read a headline in the British newspaper with the largest daily circulation—about 4,000,000—which crowed "We Shall Try Them And Hang Them." Nor did the fact that by 1946 few people in the

West had any doubts that the ghastly Katyn Forest and associated massacres of some 15,000 helpless Polish officer P.O.W.s had been perpetrated by one of the parties which were about to sit on the bench of the International Military Tribunal. Many of us in the armed forces knew much more than that. We knew, although we did not talk about it very much, that the most dreadful atrocities had been committed by all the major parties in the war that had just concluded. And in the years that have followed, our knowledge of that aspect has increased prodigiously.

But I was only a junior officer and very young. There were a number of prominent men, far more important and knowledgeable than a mere flight lieutenant, who were disturbed and distressed. And it is very doubtful if any of them could have been accused of sympathy with the ideology of National Socialism or even with the Germans as a nation. Apart from a long list of eminent scholars and revisionist historians—too long to attempt to catalogue here—there were in England such men as The Very Reverend William Inge, Dean of St. Paul's, or the attorney, F.J.P. Veale, whose book, *Advance to Barbarism*, is still one of the most effective critiques of the Nuremberg mentality. And in the United States, Senator Robert A. Taft knowingly sacrificed his career and a fair chance at the American Presidency by speaking publicly against the implementation of *ex post facto* law as repugnant to the whole tradition of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence and the letter and spirit of the United States Constitution. That this *was* political suicide—and Taft knew it—is a thought for the younger reader to ponder while trying to comprehend the fanatical spirit of vengeance which dominated the era. President John F. Kennedy well understood the nature of Taft's deed and honored him for it in his book, *Profiles in Courage*.

How different it all is today! We have learned so many things in recent years—the truth about the sinking of the Lusitania in World War I, for example; or the truth about the Churchill-Lindemann-Harris policy of terror bombing. Much, much else. Or *is* it really so different? The publishing houses, many of them, and *a fortiori* the movies and television, remind us almost daily of the thesis of a special Teutonic diabolism. *

At the time of this writing, thirty-five years have passed since the end of World War II. Can we possibly find some historical analog—not too distant—for the events which have taken place in the intervening years? Perhaps that would help us to gauge the truth or falsity implicit in the title of Veale's book.

* In early 1981 it was revealed that Churchill had made plans to rain mustard gas and deadly anthrax bombs on German civilian centers. If the war had not ended when it did, his plans would have been carried out and large areas of Germany, even today (1981) would not be habitable. Hitler, however, never seriously considered the use of gas except in retaliation to gas attacks. One reason, perhaps, is that Hitler was himself a victim of British gas warfare in the trenches of the First World War.—Ed.

In 1792, the French Revolutionary government began a virtually continuous war of aggression for the next twenty-three years against most of the rest of Europe. Its purposes were twofold: to rally and unite factions within the nation, and to seize the territory and exploit the resources of its neighbors. By 1796, the career of Napoleon Bonaparte was in full flower. For nineteen more years, the Napoleonic armies marched and countermarched across all Europe, drenching the soil of the continent in blood. Belgium, Holland and much of Italy and western Germany were annexed directly to France. The art treasures of the conquered peoples were looted. Forced contributions of money and manpower were exacted from the satellite nations. Political enemies were assassinated. General Napoleon became dictator of France by a *coup d'etat* in 1799, and emperor in 1804.

When, in 1814, Napoleon was first defeated by the vast coalition ranged against him ("How many crows were ye against the dying eagle?") he abdicated and was granted sovereignty over the Italian island of Elba. He escaped and returned to France in 1815, raised more armies and resumed the war. After his final defeat at Waterloo, he again abdicated and was taken to the Atlantic island of St. Helena. On the way, the ship docked at Plymouth where English crowds turned out, not to gloat or to jeer, but to pay their respects to their fallen foe. Napoleon spent the remaining six years of his life on St. Helena writing his memoirs and living, with a suitable staff of aides and servants, in relative comfort (apart from some petty irritations inflicted by the rather spiteful governor). In 1840, his body was brought home to France and entombed magnificently in *Les Invalides.* There he lies, surrounded by murals of his greatest victories, to this day the supreme national hero of France. When Queen Victoria visited Paris, she went to see Napoleon's tomb and there she made her young son kneel in homage.

By 1918, the chivalrous and aristocratic ethos had long given place to that of *homo vulgaris*, democracy *triumphans.* And so there was heard much talk of hanging the Kaiser. But it was only splenetic prattle. He had sought refuge in Holland and no great pressure was exerted upon the Dutch to surrender him. In any event, he lived out his life as a comfortable country squire on his estate at Doorn. As a final note on this part of our topic, it may be remarked that the terms imposed on Prussia in 1807 were far more severe than those imposed on France in 1815; and the terms imposed on Germany in 1919 were savagely punitive and "Carthaginian" compared with those imposed on France by Germany in 1871.

But it was not until 1945 that the victors finally progressed to the level of the Book of Esther or the story of Samuel and Agag. Could it be that this was the ultimate triumph of Christianity? That we were at last taking the Bible as a serious guide to conduct? Or was it the triumph of demo-
of the Book of Esther or the story of Samuel and Agag. Could it be that
something!

The defendants at Nuremberg were separately charged on two, three or four counts. Twelve men. including Rosenberg, were charged on all four counts. These were:

1. Conspiracy to wage war.
2. Crimes against peace.
3. War crimes.
4. Crimes against humanity.

Richard Harwood (*Nuremberg and Other War Crimes Trials*) comments as follows:

> THE CHARGES could have been drawn up by some poet or philosopher, for no specific item of legislation passed by any specified legislature was alleged to have been broken. For someone to be charged with a crime necessitates their breaking a law. No country had, or has, a law against waging war. Neither does any country have a law against waging "aggressive" war. Who defines the aggression? When Britain and France invaded Egypt in 1956, their leaders and generals were not arrested and charged with waging aggressive war.
>
> Every single one of the charges could have been equally well laid at the Allies door. Consider:
>
> 1. Conspiracy to wage war
>
> the Anglo-French-planned invasion of Norway
> Stalin's planned invasion of Poland
> Roosevelt's plans to enmesh the USA in the war
>
> 2. Crimes against peace
>
> Stalin's invasion of Poland and Finland
> Britain's invasion of Iraq [and Iran]
> Britain's sinking of the French fleet at Oran
> American invasion of Iceland and Greenland

3. War crimes
   the wanton destruction of German cities
   the Soviet' murder and ill-treatment of German POWs
   the use of Germans as slave laborers after the war in all the Allied European countries

4. Crimes against humanity
   the Soviet massacre of the Poles at Katyn
   the Anglo-American bombing of civilian targets
   the Soviet atrocities against their own people before and during the war.

Harwood has by no means exhausted the list. Individual acts of the most appalling sadism and cruelty were committed by Allied soldiers against both Germans and Japanese who had already surrendered. Incidents of rape and looting were a feature of all the Allied occupation forces in the early days, but the wholesale and unchecked rape of the women, girls and boys in Berlin, the looting and sacking of that city by the armies of Marshals Zhukov and Koniev, and the instant killing of any German civilian who tried to shield his womenfolk, make the horrors of the Thirty Years War read like an exercise in knightly and gentlemanly conduct.

But amid the cant and solemnity of the Nuremberg "trials," the victors would not accept any charges of misconduct against themselves. Alfred Rosenberg was found guilty on all four counts and, as we have already noted, met his end on the gallows on the morning of the 16th of October, 1946. He left behind a widow and a young daughter.

Who was this rather quiet and withdrawn—even shy—man with the somewhat bland good looks of an upper-class English senior civil servant? By all accounts he was, in his personal life, a kind man, rather humorless, incorruptible. There was neither cynicism nor pragmatism in his fanatical dedication to the National Socialist ideology but the fanaticism only became eloquent in his writing. He lacked the extrovert geniality to be a good conversationalist. This introversion was certainly not characteristic of the generality of the Nazi leaders—not even of Hess whose withdrawal appears to have developed as a result of his treatment by his British captors after his peace-seeking flight to Scotland in 1941. Rosenberg seems to have been the butt of a good deal of rough humor in upper party circles, and not the least on account of his name which, in Germany, was thought of as typically Jewish, although in the Baltic area from where he came it was commonly a gentile name also. Yet Rosenberg remained

always totally loyal and, apart from Hitler himself, was the only member of the party to remain prominent from the earliest days until the very end. But he was not equipped by training or temperament for the rough and tumble of practical affairs.

Rosenberg's tastes and interests lay in classical music, architecture, and above all in literary and philosophical matters. Among the great German philosophers, the works of Immanuel Kant and Arthur Schopenhauer seem to have made the deepest and most lasting impression. But he was a voracious reader. He certainly read Ernst Haeckel, probably the most famous of the German Indologists. He read a great deal of the Aryan literature of ancient India, especially the *Rig Veda*, and it is evident that he was well-acquainted with the *Zend Avesta*, the sacred book of ancient, pre-Islamic Persia. He steeped himself in the classical history of Greece and Rome and especially in classical mythology. This almost omnivorous and self-directed study, together with his personal experiences in revolutionary Russia and post-war Germany, were the two pillars upon which he constructed his final and passionate world-view.

His vocation, however, as he saw it and as he partially fulfilled it, was to become the custodian of the party ideology and the author of a *magnum opus* which would provide National Socialism with a definitive theory of history as a function of race. That work *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts*— (*The Myth of the Twentieth Century*).

National Socialist orthodoxy was never as monolithic nor as all-embracing as that of Marx and Lenin. There was, of course, agreement on the major issues—that World Jewry was the irreconcilable enemy of all Aryan civilization and culture and especially of Germany; that the punitive clauses of the Treaty of Versailles were intolerable and must be rejected; that all Germans must understand and feel their spiritual unity as a true *Volk* and that distinctions and rivalries of class and faction must disappear. But apart from such general principles, there was a wide variety of opinions and philosophic positions. Rosenberg was well aware of this and at considerable pains in his Introduction to emphasize that the *Mythos* was a *personal* philosophy. He is, for example, almost as violent-anti-Catholic as he is anti-Jewish and only relatively less anti-Protestant. He is, in fact, anti-Christian. Yet most of the party rank and file were Christian, and Germany is half Catholic.

Jesus of Nazareth, he thought, was a great man whose teachings had been corrupted by a clever Jew, Paul of Tarsus. In the following centuries, the Catholic church had evolved an elaborate theology and ceremonial

which had nothing in common with the Founder and was, in fact, a resurgence of degraded Leveantine-Etruscan superstitions decked out in spuriously "Christian" forms.

But Rosenberg's quarrel with the Catholics was not simply or solely a matter of theology. There was in Germany a powerful Catholic *political* party, the *Zentrum Partei.* Even Bismarck, in the nineteenth century, had seen the *political* nature of the Catholics in Germany as a danger to the internal peace and new-won unification of the nation. It must be remembered that the Second Reich which came into being in January 1871 and expired in November 1918 was never a strongly centralized State. It contained four kingdoms—Prussia, Bavaria, Württemberg and Saxony, five grand duchies, thirteen duchies, three free cities and the Imperial Territory . . . of elsess-Lothringer had been a dream which only . . . three short but bitter wars had been able to realize. Bavaria, Würtemberg and the Rhineland were predominantly Catholic, and separatist tendencies always threatened to surface in time of crisis—encouraged by France and, at least in the view of Protestant Prussia, aggravated by the recently proclaimed doctrine of Papal infallibility which had set all Protestant Europe by the ears. The ultramontanism which had developed as a reaction to the Napoleonic and French Revolutionary wars was fundamentally anti-nationalist. It was so seen even in Catholic Italy where the conflict between Italian nationalism and the Vatican was called "the Roman Question" and was not resolved until Mussolini's Concordat with the Pope in 1929. There was a strong anti-clerical party in France. And so, in Prussia the struggle against *political* Catholicism was waged by Bismarck under the banner of the *Kulturkampf* and the so-called "May" or "Falk" laws of 1873. The Jesuits were also expelled from the territory of the *Reich.*

In the first few years following World War I, there were renewed dangers of separatism in Catholic Bavaria and, even more seriously in the Rhineland, where the separatist movement was encouraged by the French government and the French armies of occupation. It is in the light of the foregoing that we must consider Rosenberg's attacks upon the Catholic church—not as an explicit political philosophy, perhaps, but rather as a kind of gut-level perception of an irreconcilably inimical force in the national body. Before deriding this as the "backward" attitudes of *Mitteleuropa* sixty years ago, Americans might usefully remind themselves that when John Kennedy was seeking the Democratic nomination, sophisticated American politicos expressed doubts as to whether a Catholic would be acceptable to the American people as their president and many ordinary citizens of Protestant persuasion were genuinely alarmed that the White House might become a branch office of the Vatican.

What of Rosenberg's yet greater enemy, the Jew? In some ways, the explanation is simpler and in others more profoundly complex than his hostility to the Catholics. There was a certain amount of literary and intellectual anti-semitism in Germany and Hapsburg Austria in the nineteenth century, but it was hardly more than that which also existed in contemporary England. In England, for example, *Punch*, the popular humorous magazine, frequently featured derogatory cartoons and verses involving Jews. Lord Salisbury, and other prominent Englishmen, called Disraeli "an unscrupulous Jew."

People who found themselves in financial difficulties and had to resort to money lenders were said, pityingly, to be "in the hands of the Jews." And the very word "jew" was and is used as a verb, as in the expression "to jew one down."

In Russia, anti-Jewish sentiment was much stronger and combined two elements, peasant religiosity and the political perception of the anarchistic, revolutionary and terrorist movements as being heavily Jewish in their leadership. But it was probably in France where animosity to the Jews was strongest. The early years of the Third Republic were beset by a number of financial scandals which caused grievous losses to the small investors and considerable suffering. When a number of these were uncovered and Jewish financiers figured very prominently, a bitter anti-semitism prevailed in France which reached its apogee in the Dreyfus case. One perhaps should also mention Poland, at that time part of the domains of the Russian Tsar, where anti-semitism was pandemic and where it persisted at least until the end of the Second World War, since when its overt expression has become a criminal offense.

Rosenberg's anti-semitism may have had its earliest roots in his youth as a subject of the Tsar. But it was doubtless his personal and direct experience of living in Moscow at the time of the Bolshevik Revolution that made the greatest initial impression. There is no longer any real dispute among honest historians that the leadership of the Bolsheviks (as well as the Social Revolutionary Party—which was a much larger group) was predominantly Jewish. No less an authority than Winston Churchill wrote an article for the *Illustrated Sunday Herald* (London) in February 1920, entitled "Zionism versus Bolshevism: A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People," in which he pointed out that Jews dominated the short-lived Communist regimes of Bela Kun in Hungary and Kurt Eisner in Bavaria no less than in Lenin's Russia.

Rosenberg's extensive reading certainly reinforced his personal observations. He had read the works of Paul de Lagarde, a nineteenth-century professor of oriental languages at Göttingen University who was strongly

anti-semitic. He had read the Frenchman, Count Arthur de Gobineau, whose book, *On the Inequality of Human Races*, is the seminal work of racialist thinking. Above all, he had read, at the age of seventeen, Houston Stewart Chamberlain's monumental *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*. This last is intensely anti-Jewish and anti-Catholic.

The Aryan race has been the creative force in all civilization. The modern Germans and their kindred peoples are the current bearers of this creative and civilizing force (a view shared, among others, by Theodore Roosevelt and Cecil Rhodes). Southern Europe is a miscegenated "chaos of the peoples" and the Jew, above all, is the eternal enemy of Aryan values and Aryan culture.

Rosenberg, in his memoirs, tells us that this book of Chamberlain's "set him at once on fire." Chamberlain, it might be mentioned in passing, was the son of a British admiral and the son-in-law of Richard Wagner. But it was in post-war Germany that the final influence must have shaped Rosenberg's thinking. He had visited German relatives before the war. Until 1918, however, he had been a student at Moscow University. He graduated in Architecture, a field he never subsequently pursued. He must have been a talented student, however, for he was asked by his professor to remain at the University as a member of the faculty.

Instead he made his way to a defeated, humiliated and starving Germany, apparently by way of Paris. The leadership of the radical Left parties, the Communists, the Social Democrats, the Independent Socialists and the Spartacists, was mostly Jewish. It had been these elements which had promoted disastrous strikes in the last year of the war and had been largely instrumental in fomenting the insurrections and the naval mutiny which led to the abdication of the Kaiser and the establishment of the so-called Weimar Republic.

Whether Germany could have long continued to resist the enormous power of the Allies, especially after the total collapse of her own three allies, is a moot point. But it was commonly felt throughout Germany that the total defeat and utter helplessenss of Germany before the triumphant victors was precipitated and made inevitable by treason on the home front in which Jewish influence was the greatest factor and that, but for this, Germany might have held out long enought to secure a truly negotiated peace rather than submit to a merciless *Diktat*.

Nor was this all. Until hated Tsarist Russia had been overthrown and defeated, world Jewry and, especially, German Jewry had supported the cause of the central powers. After that, Jewish support switched to the

allies. The negotiations in 1916 which led up to the Balfour Declaration of the following year were later admitted by the British wartime Prime Minister, David Lloyd George, to have been undertaken because of the need felt to win the support of the Zionist movement throughout the world. There exists strongly suggestive evidence that the success of this ploy created a *quid pro quo* situation between the British government and the powerful American Zionists who, in turn, brought irresistible pressure on President Wilson to bring about the decisive participation of the United States in the war.

In any event, the Weimar Republic which lasted from the end of 1918 to the beginning of 1933, was politically a middle-of-the-road democracy. Socially it was a period of extreme libertarianism and, indeed, license. Berlin came to be seen by traditionalist and conservative observers as the "cesspool of Europe." To others, it was the haven of total permissiveness where anything went and every passion and vice could be indulged with impunity. Istvan Deak, who admired Berlin society of the period, wrote of it:

> Berlin harbored those who elsewhere might have been subjected to ridicule or persecution. Comintern agents. Dadaist poets, expressionist painters, anarchist philosophers, *Sexualwissenschaftler,* vegetarian and Esperantist prophets of a new humanity. *Schnorrer* ("freeloaders," artists of coffeehouse indolence) courtesans, homosexuals, drug addicts, naked dancers, and professional criminals flourished in a city which was hungry for the new, the sensational, the extreme. Moreover, Berlin became the cultural center of Central and Eastern Europe as well.

Peter Gay, another well-known Jewish historian, in a book with a significant sub-title (*Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider*), writes in a similar vein, telling us that when we think of Weimar, we think of modernity in art, literature and thought; we think of the rebellion of sons against fathers, Dadaists against art, libertines against old-fashioned moralists; we think of the *The Threepenny Opera, The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari, The Magic Mountain,* the *Bauhaus,* Marlene Dietrich . . .

Die Weltbuhne was the most prominent and influential of the left-wing literary journals. Not to have read the latest issue, according to Kurt Hiller, was considered uncouth. Of the sixty-eight writers whose religious

origins could be established, forty-two were found to be of Jewish descent, two were half-Jews and only twenty-four were non-Jews (of whom three were married to Jewesses) Deak tells us: "The enthusiasm of the *Weltbuhne* writers for revolutionary socialist propositions was to a great part due to the recognition of their inescapable Jewish condition."

Deak tells us further, but with an air of approbation, that of those who now dictated public taste and morals and "corrupted their customers" more than three-fourths were not natives, but came from Austria, Hungry, the Ukraine and Poland. These were the people whom Walter Rathenau, himself a Jew, called "an Asiatic horde on the Brandenburg sands."

The late Sir. Arthur Bryant, a respected historian and a conservative Christian gentleman, wholly out of sympathy with the Nazi regime which followed the Weimar period, is by reason of those very qualities and traits a most reliable source is dealing with the nature of the Weimar Republic. In his book, *Unfinished Victory*, which was published just before the outbreak of World War II, he describes in vivid and evocative language the alien quality of the "200,000 or more Jews" who thronged Berlin. Many of them (he says) had poured into the country during the post-war upheaval. They did not stay poor long. Bryant points out that as late as November 1938, after five years of anti-Jewish legislation, Jews still owned about one-third of all real property in the Reich, most of it acquired during the disastrous inflation of 1923 with foreign funds obtained through their international connections.

In 1924, Viscount D'Abernon, the British ambassador, held a conversation with Gustav Stresemann in which the latter spoke of the growing hatred of the Jews. "The mass of the people," said Stresemann, "are discontented because they find that they themselves are poor while the Jews are rich, and they ask, 'why has the government allowed this?' "

Bryant says that although the Jews comprised only one percent of the population, their control of the national wealth and power soon lost all relation to their numbers. In the 1924 Reichstag, a quarter of the Social Democrats were Jews. Jews controlled 57% of the metal trade, 22% of the grain, and 39% of the textile. More then 50% of the members of the Berlin Chamber of Commerce were Jews, as were 1,200 of the 1,474 members of the Stock Exchange. Of the 29 legitimate theaters in Berlin, 23 had Jewish directors. At one point, says Bryant (quoting an *anti*-Nazi book by E. Mowrer, *Germany Puts the Clock Back*), so complete was the Jewish monoply of the Press that "a telephone connection between [sic] three Jews in Ministerial Offices could effect the suspension of any newspaper in the State."

Authorship, continues Bryant, was almost a Jewish monopoly. In 1931, of 144 film scripts worked, 119 were written by Jews and 77 produced by them. Medicine and law followed the same pattern; 42% of the Berlin doctors were Jews (1,932) and 48% of the lawyers. "Every year it became harder for a Gentile to gain or keep a foothold in any privileged occupation."

In Walter Mehring's play *The Merchant of Berlin*, the hero, a poverty-stricken Jewish immigrant,

> . . . soon has the whole town at his feet with his wonderful adroitness and freedom from bourgeois moral scruples . . . he derides every cherished symbol of German morality and national pride and holds them up to ridicule. The soldier's corpse and steel helmet . . . swept away with the scourings of the street, are shown to weigh nothing . . . against the predatory courage, the quick cunning and the rollicking sensual opportunism of the little hero. To the disinherited German they stood for something very different—for love of country, duty now shamed and made the sport of the gutter. Human beings with their long and diverse histories cannot always be expected to see things in the same way.

Bryant points out that beggars on horseback are seldom popular and that this particular species was arrogant, vulgar and vicious. In a particularly moving passage, he speaks of his vivid and painful recollection of seeing the throngs of half-starving children of both sexes who haunted the doors of the great hotels and restaurants to sell their bodies to rich *arrivistes*.

There follow several pages in Bryant's book of detailed description of the contents of display windows of bookshops specializing in pornography and the literature of perversion, and of the general moral degradation in daily life and in art. Bryant is distressed, too, by the undisguised scorn for Christianity—a Jewish poet's (Carl Zuckmayer) comparing a cat caterwauling on the roof at night with Jesus at Gethsemane, or a Jewish writer's depicting Christ as a drunken lecher.

Major Francis Yeats-Brown (*European Jungle*) adds a few figures to Bryant's, relative to the disproportionate power of Jews in the professions. He tells us that in Berlin 1,925 out of 3,450 lawyers were Jews and in Frankfort, 432 out of 659. Fifteen Jewish bankers held 718 directorships. In Vienna, 85% of the lawyers, 70% of the dentists, more than

50% of the physicians, were Jews. The boot and shoe industry was 80% Jewish, as were the newspapers; the banks, 75%; the wine trade, 73%; the cinema, 70%; lumber and paper, 70%; fur and furriers, 87%; bakeries and laundries, 60%.

Even Dr. Chaim Weizmann, who was visiting Germany at the height of the immediate post-war economic distress in order to *raise money* for the Jewish immigrants in Palestine, spoke disparagingly of the Jews in Germany. He told the British Ambassador that Jewish intellectuals in Germany were most overbearing and aggressive, and quite intolerable. Most significantly, he referred to them as "a race apart, differing widely from the native races." But the "race apart" dominated the culture and many, if not most, of the professions, as we have indicated above. Peter Gay, writing of the vast Ulstein publishing empire, says that their power was almost frightening and that for a writer without a private income the favor of Ulstein meant luxury, its disfavor near-starvation.

In the flourishing theatre, even the great classics were cut, edited and distorted to fit the exigencies of left-wing propaganda. Leopold Jessner, whom Gay calls "the most powerful man in the Weimar theatre," staged a deliberate distortion of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* in which all the patriotic references to Fatherland were cut and the play converted into a call for revolution. The tyrant Gessler was portrayed as a bemedalled caricature of a Junker general. Albert Bassermann played Tell and Fritz Kortner played Gessler. Both were Jews. The production was in 1919. Well might Gay say:

> Hugo Preuss, the architect of the Weimar Constitution, was a symbol of the revolution; as a Jew and a left-wing democrat . . . he, the outsider, gave shape to the new Republic, *his* Republic.

In his study of the *Weltbuhne,* Deak tells us that it was the duty of that journal to plead the case of the convicted criminal, the abortionist mother, the homosexual, and the prostitute. In 1925, Erich Leisar, in its pages, was demanding legalized abortion. The magazine ardently espoused the cause of George Grosz in his trial (he was acquitted) for publishing a blasphemous cartoon. Kurt Hiller demanded the abolition of laws against homosexuality, and Magnus Hirschfeld objected even to the prohibition against adult immorality with children.

Kurt Tucholsky, a *Weltbuhne* editor, wrote that the journal served a good cause, that of transforming *Teutschland* into *Deutschland*. (*Teuschland* is an archaic form used symbolically to represent all that was

traditional and historic in Germany.) A brief glance at some of Tucholsky's utterances and attitudes as reported in Deak's work might well epitomize this limited sampling of our subject. That " . . . Judaism and unquestioning German patriotism were mutally exclusive propositions . . . " may well be true, and Tucholsky seems to have sought out every sensitive and exposed nerve he could find in order to play upon it. His favorite target was the Army. German officers during the war, he declared, had cared more for their whores than their men. In a brilliant but savage pun on *Ein Volk der Dichter und Denker*; (a people of poets and thinkers), he called the German people "*Ein Volk der Richter und Henker*" ("a people of judges and hangmen"):

> . . . we betray a state that we disavow . . . The country I am allegedly betraying is not my country; this state is not my state; this legal system is not my legal system. Its different banners are to me as meaningless as are its provincial ideals.

Tucholsky finally gave up the editorship of *Weltbuhne* and went to live in Paris. His successor was convicted of betraying military secrets and sentenced to imprisonment in 1931.

In music (or perhaps anti-music) the name of Arnold Schönberg is prominent. The prophet of atonality developed his twelve-tone system and *Sprechgesang* in 1924. In the following year came the first performance of Alben Berg's opera *Wozzech*, which used *Schonberg's* system. The "hero" is an ignorant soldier who commits murder and suicide. In 1928 Bertolt Brecht's *Die Dreigroschenoper* opened at the Schiffbauerdamm, with music by Kurt Weill. The milieu of the play is the *lumpenproletariat* world of prostitutes, thieves and beggars, Barbara Sapinsley describes it as "a burlesque of modern society showing it ruled by a criminal underworld." Mackie Messer, says Gay taunts his bourgeois audience for loving its own fat belly and assures it "*Erst kommt das Fressen, dann kommt die moral.*"

Deak denies that Brecht was a Jew but admits that in at least two publications he is so listed. Deak's own attitudes may be evaluated by his statement that " . . . such Communists as Bertolt Brecht . . . [and others] . . . were responsible for much of the cultural brilliance and vitality of the Weimar period."

Another diabolic vision is to be found in the works of Franz Kafka. Gunther Anders, discussing Kafka's art, compares the latter's concept of beauty to the Gorgon's head. Kafka argues that the existence of evil proves the existence of an evil God: divine authority, the law, and evil, are one. The essential Jewish quality of Kafka's thought, says Anders, lies in his total rejection of the concept of "Nature," of a world apart from man and man's institutions as an untouched preserve of loveliness and reverence.

A word must be said on an institution whose lifespan coincided exactly with that of the Republic itself—the *Bauhaus*. The *Bauhaus* was opened by Walter Gropius in the city of Weimar in 1919 as a school of "artistic unity." The names associated with it were not all those of Jews. Gropius himself was not a Jew (Franz Werfel converted from Judaism to Catholicism). But most of the important figures in the circles were Jews—Paul Klee, Wassily Kandinsky, Lyonel Feininger, Gerhard Marcks, Oskar Schlemmer, Laslo Moholy-Nagy, Josef Albers, *inter alia.* Its ultimate mood was "frantic pessimism." In 1925 the citizens of Weimar expelled the *Bauhaus* artists from their town, says Deak, from where they moved, via Dessau, to Berlin.

Such then was the Germany to which the young Rosenberg came from Bolshevik Russia and which he surveyed with loathing, anger and disgust. And thus he began his fateful career in the nascent National Socialist German Workers Party. He joined the party in 1919 having attended a meeting at which he immediately and permanently fell under Hitler's spell. In 1921, he became the editor of the party newspaper, the *Volkischer Beobachter*. He contributed a great many articles and wrote and published some relatively minor books. After Hitler and Hess were imprisoned at Landsberg in 1924, Rosenberg became a kind of custodian of the, then, interdicted Nazi party. In due course, he became head of the foreign policy office of the party (not to be confused with the government foreign office) and was also in charge of defining party policy with regard to secondary and higher education. In 1940, he headed a special staff which had the responsibility of collecting and safeguarding the art treasures of the occupied Eastern territories. This gave rise to the charge against him at Nuremberg of the wholesale looting of art treasures. It might be salutary to recall in passing that some 6,000 *German* paintings were "liberated" by the American occupation authorities after World War II and shipped to the United States to be stored at Pueblo, Colorado. President Carter recently refused a request by the Bonn regime to return the paintings to their German owners.

In 1941, Rosenberg was given the responsibility of setting up the civil administration of the occupied Russian and Baltic territories. The appointment seems to have been—or soon to have become—a merely ceremonial position. His nominal subordinates, men like Erich Koch and Heinrich Löhse, exercised the real administrative power. As for the S.S., it was under the control of Heinrich Himmler and quite independent from Rosenberg's office.

At Nuremberg, Rosenberg was also charged with having encouraged the invasion of Norway. This really was a monstrous piece of Allied hypocrisy. Norwegian coastal waters had already been deliberately violated by the British navy, as in the case of the *Altmark* incident. At the time of the German invasion, an Anglo-French expeditionary force was already in the process of being formed and the Germans simply beat it to the punch. Such was the immediate confusion that Neville Chamberlain even uttered the hollow boast that "Hitler has missed the bus" when the Allies landed at Narvik.

When Rosenberg's life and career are examined with impartiality and detachment—as one would hope were possible after so long a period of time has elapsed—one is forced to the conclusion that his real "crime" was racism and, more specifically, anti-semitism. He was hanged, it would appear, for what he thought and wrote. The American prosecutor hammered away on this point. Rosenberg's writings, he charged, were instrumental in the rise of the Nazi party to power. It seems a strange sort of indictment coming from the representative of a power which is always so smugly self-congratulatory about the First Amendment.

Rosenberg was twice married. His first wife, Hilda Leesman, was a ballet student and an accomplished classical pianist. He met her in Riga and they were married in 1915. She contracted tuberculosis, apparently as a result of the dreadful privations attendant upon the war in Eastern Europe and during the Bolshevik Revolution. She went to Switzerland in 1918. Alfred and she did not see each other again and in 1923 he allowed her to divorce him. In 1925, he married Hedwig Kramer. They had one son who died in infancy and a daughter, Irene, born in 1930. Hedwig and Irene withdrew as far as possible from public life and notice after 1946.

Why should anyone read the *Mythos* today? It is open to much criticism as a book. It is not a scientific treatise on race. It is not a lofty, detached (I will not say "impartial" because historical impartiality is a noble illusion, impossible to attain) work of history, Rosenberg is no stylist. His mind races ahead of his syntax and one subordinate clause after another attach themselves to his original sentences. The result, all too often,

reminds the reader of Mark Twain's dictum: "whenever the literary German dives into a sentence, that is the last you are going to see of him till he emerges on the other side of the Atlantic with the verb in his mouth." His citations do not conform to the accepted canons of scholarship. While patently honest and authentic, they are often incomplete as to publishing data.

But when all these negative aspects have been given due notice, there remains a battery of the most powerful arguments for reading him. For students of history, the *Mythos* is an important historical document. For students of politics and political psychology, it is equally so. There is vast and most impressive erudition. It might not be too high-flown to say that there is the soul of a man and, perhaps of a nation—or at least of an epoch—on display. Our knowledge and understanding of the ideology and the *Zeitgeist* of the Third Reich and, indeed, of its immediate antecedents, is seriously incomplete without the *Mythos*.

It is not the function of the writer of an Introduction to another man's work to adumbrate the contents and arguments of that work. Still less is it his function to analyze and argue the *pros* and *cons* of the argumentation or the validity of the author's views. Briefly, therefore, and in conclusion, Rosenberg's view is that the various races of man possess racial souls. These racial souls are as enduring and immutable as the racial phenotype—no more and no less. They give rise to cultures, values, religions and political systems which are uniquely congruent with the race in question and are alien to any other race. Miscegenation brings about the degeneration and destruction of such cultures by reason of a kind of schizophrenic condition of racial bastardy. Aryan man has created all the great civilizations of ancient India, ancient Persia, Greece, Rome and, probably, Egypt. Each has ultimately decayed and falled by reason of race-mixing.

It is certainly not a new idea. Juvenal in the second century, contemplating the polyglot, polyracial population of a Rome which by then was mainly made up of Levantines, Egyptians and other Near Eastern immigrants, uttered his famous warning: "*In Tiberim defluxit Orontes.*" The last great Aryan civilization is that created by the Teutonic branches of the Aryan race since the fall of Rome. That civilization is now threatened by a rebellion and resurgence of the non-Aryan elements—especially the Jews and Levantine Christianity. The natural values of Aryan man include the concept of honor which takes precedence over the Christian ethics of diffuse and undirected love and pity. The Aryan pantheon is one of sky-gods, not earth or subterranean (cthonian) deities. Aryan society is partriarchal rather than matriachal. Aryan man is the first and only racial

type which has been able to construct rational scientific and investigatory systems of thought, free from superstitious or religious corruptions. Why did Rosenberg think that way? What evidence or argumentation does he offer to support his case? For that, patient reader, you must read his book.

Peter Peel

Reseda, California 1980

Introduction to the English Edition

Along with Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and Hermann Goering's *Germany Reborn*, Alfred Rosenberg's *Myth of the Twentieth Century* created the basis of German National Socialist political thought. It may be compared with these other two works on several fronts. All three authors were practitioners of the social and political thought which they taught. None wrote in a vacuum. All were a part of the formation of their milieu. All saw the same perils in store with the political system which had operated through 1933. All were anti-semitic, although Goering was overtly less so than the other two. All were super-nationalists who operated in a world that was being drawn into a powerful internationalism.

The *Myth* can be viewed as a sequel to Stewart Houston Chamberlain's *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*. It is like that work, yet it differs from the *Foundations* in a number of vital ways. It filled many of the expectations Chamberlain had, although it changed a number of his goals. It could not have been written without the *Foundations* and it is more than a sequel.

Rosenberg was influenced by a number of writers of the German past. Some are seen quite openly, notably Meister Eckehart. Others are observed in influence and thought only by the trained reader. These include Nietzsche, Wagner and Ludwig Jahn. Rosenberg was the logical culmination of much of the German mind and he was a principal shaper of that mind, at least during the period 1933-45.

Rosenberg was wholly loyal to Adolf Hitler, but he conflicted on major points with others in Hitler's camp. His feud with Dr. Paul Joseph Goebbels is almost legendary and cannot wholly be reconciled within standard national socialist thought. It struck at the bases of the new state system. Where Goebbels favored a modern, concentrated, industrial state, Rosenberg preferred a rural, medieval, dispersed society.

* * *

The title of Rosenberg's book was chosen carefully. It was a book that was designed to guide Germany and other Nordic nations in the present century. Once accepted, used and promulgated, its ideas would necessarily shape Germany for the proverbial thousand years of Hitler's reich. It was a blueprint which offered certain theories, ideas and designs for the rebirth of the Nordic race. It listed the evils of the present era while offering an overview of their origins. It would have been incomprehensible to the minds of the 16th, 17th, 18th or 19th centuries.

The myth suggested in the title is more complex. A myth is an idea which can be used in many ways. If I am unable to explain something directly I may choose to concoct a myth by using an allegory of what is known. For those who cannot understand directly I may offer an explanation by analogy. If this story becomes a guiding light it takes on mythical qualities.

A myth may also explain what is, by any terms, wholly inexplicable. I may not be able to know God directly, but I may speak of Him indirectly, as by myth. Myth is used to speak the unspeakable, fathom the unfathomable and think the unthinkable. It thus becomes a reflection of what is known. But the myth is still other than the thing-in-itself.

A myth may also be a truth which is greater than conventional truth. In the writings of the medieval Scholastic school, led by Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, much was made of metaphysical truth. The term *meta* means beyond and *metaphysics* suggest something which is beyond the physical reality we know and can experience. It is something beyond and above mere empirical verification. It is known to be true inwardly, in one's conscience or soul. Myth for Rosenberg takes on all of these characteristics of metaphysical truth, and is limited by none of them. I know that God exists not by direct observation or by direct contact or by placing God under a microscope. Nonetheless, His existence is a reality beyond a shadow of doubt.

Myth is, of course, more than a tale, an analogy or metaphysical truth as it is applied in Rosenberg's great work. Myth is a moving and a shaping-directive power. It resides not only in the individual but in his race. It resides in the person exclusively because he is a part of that race or culture. A strong and a great myth may have such power that it can extend its vital spark to another of a different race-culture because that individual resides in the myth-bearing culture.

No one factor accounts for a myth. It is a part of one's whole heritage. It is born in the person. Even if an individual becomes a part of another culture he is called, deep down inside, by his own myth. It is a sum total of the culture, mores, folkways, customs, art, traditions, legends, history, experience and will of his own race, and it is even more than these things. It is the embodied vital will of great men. It is the contributions, defeats, failures, hopes, aspiration and accomplishments of the ethnically-related members of the group.

Here, the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The myth is the scaffolding, the superstructure on which all these other things are constructed. It is the skeleton around which the organic body is built. It is the framework which is covered over by a whole beautiful building. It is the form upon which, bit by bit, piece by piece, yard by yard, a people develops. But without the ordering of a myth the people is merely a helter-skelter collection of all these various facts and facets.

The myth may begin as a single event. Rosenberg identified his great event as the first world war. It was the factor which made all the contributing elements coalesce around the one central event. In and of itself, it defies rational description. It cannot be wholly isolated for it works not on the body of man but on his spirit. It works not a physical spell but a metaphysical one. It touches not man's outer being but his inner self, his spirit, his true personality.

A nation without a vital myth drifts aimlessly throughout history. Myth gives purpose and meaning to the civilization. Myth makes a people a nation and a nation a race and a race a contributor to the world. Myth shapes the race so that the race may fulfill the potential of its individuals. The myth makes us conscious that we are a race, and not merely an arbitrary, purposeless, ill-defined conglomerate of men and women.

The German-Nordic race is unthinkable as a civilization-forming, purposeful group without its myth. That, Rosenberg argued, was the great problem of his contemporary Germany. It had failed to develop a myth or to recognize it. It failed to see the necessity of having a directive myth in recent centuries. It lost the old Nordic myth, which was natural as its

purpose had long ago been served, but it failed to develop, or to listen to the voice of, the new myth. It had seen the myth covered over, buried by false, non-Germanic myths such as those offered by the Jews and the Romans.

It took the terrible blood-letting of the first world war to force great leaders to acknowledge the new myth. Its cries were covered over so deeply that only such a powerful event could awaken the Aryan spirit. In that sense, at least, the suffering and deprivation of the war was worth the price. However, all would be futile if the internationalists and the ancient enemies of the Nordic people would be able to suppress the maturing myth.

* * *

There have been many myths. The Chinese developed one suited to their race, culture and mind. So did the ancient inhabitants of the Indian subcontinent. The ancient Nordic peoples who inhabited North, East and Central Europe had a myth. The Nordic culture had spread southward, influencing the Greek and Roman myths and peoples. Then, little by little, each group lost vital feeling for its myths and the civilizations declined.

The Chinese, Rosenberg said, have maintained their myth better than any other group. But they have not grown and neither has their myth. It was a great and strong myth, but it did not permit competition. Its whole philosophy was unchallenged from within and without. It allowed for no change and no development. It even captured kindred peoples, like the Mongols and the Manchus, when they conquered China.

A myth is good for a period of time, but it is not meant to be eternal. The Chinese thus demostrate to Rosenberg a highly inflexible character which can progress so far, but no further. Theirs is a changeless world and would, left to its own devices, remain always so. But the influx of alien culture, notably of the English, altered the old myth. The English, and Westerners in general, were themselves, to a limited degree, captured by the Chinese myth. But since they simultaneously destroyed it, they really left a vacuum which the Chinese could not fill on their own.

The great problem came in the short-range imperialistic conquest of the territory as against the long-range inculcation of the Western mind by the Chinese mystique. Since that myth had been tailored over centuries by learned members of that race, it could not possibly be absorbed by the White race in a short time. Thus, Western civilization skimmed off parts

of ideas and individual thoughts, which, in and of themselves, are truly meaningless. They do not fit with the true Nordic myth and they are not things which can stand on their own except in relationship to an entire state of mind and climate of opinion.

The Indian myth was conquered by alien peoples who changed and altered the ancient Aryan myths. They kept some of the old ways and ideas, but these were related to wholly different bases. The caste system was changed so that it became unrecognizable. The values were turned upside down. The organizational principles were turned inside out. Still, if one knows where to look, he can find traces of a myth that is very much akin to the old and the new Nordic value system and myth.

However, Rosenberg revolts against the idea of becoming enraptured by the Indian path to secular salvation. He objected to the acceptance of the strange reversals of logic and the manipulation of words that pass as profound philosophy. These he views merely as the last remnants of a wholly decadent society which is beyond a moral reconstruction.

The old Nordic myth forms a powerful substructure on which to build a new myth. It developed significant and proper supreme values. It laid emphasis on honor and freedom and the inner worth of man. These values carry an eternal compulsion with them. To a degree, ancient Indian myths had just such supreme values, but they are all but lost today.

One cannot merely imitate the old, but he can use what is good and eternal. The Nordic character was unchanging so its Aryan precursors in India and Iran are instructive today. German man can accept much of what ancient Nordic man built in pre-historic, and certainly pre-Roman, times. But he must move forward on his own.

* * *

Myths are formed, first and foremost, by type-creating individuals. To comprehend what Rosenberg means here we must first look a moment at Friedrich Nietzsche. Nietzsche taught the doctrine of the overman (or the superman) who could create a whole new pattern of existence on his own.

For Nietzsche the world was eternal and history repeated itself endlessly and without meaning. But history was limited in its number and variety of expressive forms. One could achieve secular immortality, hence salvation without religion, if he could create a whole new type of person, a new form of human expression.

To accomplish that one had to place great emphasis on the person and his ego. He had to permit him to do whatever was useful and necessary to work that act of creation. All values had to be directed at the one supreme

value. The Christian ethic of meekness, charity, humility, love and so on had to be subordinated to the ego-serving values of the overman.

The future would be merely a repetition of the past unless changed by the individual act of one man. Thus, one can speak of the unsuccessful overman as a type-forming individual.

For Rosenberg, type-forming meant—in the large—myth-forming, myth-shaping and myth-discovering individuals. Such persons would be willing to risk all to create the new myth or to restore the supreme values of the old myth. They would be the rebels against the corrupt establishment.

The type-forming individual may carry his race only so far. Luther, for example, was unwilling to purge the Christian religion of its Jewish elements. He acknowledged that his idea of salvation through faith came from St. Paul. Had Luther been fully type-forming he would have repudiated Paul for his Judaic ideas. Nonetheless, Luther can be regarded as type-forming, but not in a total sense.

Rosenberg's ideal, Meister Eckehart, also failed to conform wholly to the ideal. He, like Luther, began a revolution, but he did not complete it. Nonetheless, he helped to form types of men who were able to move the race ahead. These early type-forming persons were the giants on whose shoulders others climbed so that they could see farther.

Type-forming leaders create a mold, a pattern. Others freely fit themselves into that mold. Frederick the Great showed the values of honor and courage and others followed that pattern. Once the masses come to recognize the necessity of these values the myth had been created. The example of the great, type-forming man weighs heavily on others. The example has a compelling quality about it. It provides the quality of action that inspires others to choose to follow freely. I may admire Frederick and thus choose to make my life like his. In a secular field it is precisely the same thing that one finds in religious terms with the saints.

This is the true meaning of castes. One recognizes that certain men are above the masses. These true examples are to be followed. Mass leveling cannot be permitted. The recognition of the necessity of having type-fitters carries with it the recognition of placing such individuals in special places. True leadership, call it secular charisma, inspires others to follow unless some artifical leveling intervenes. If we seek type-forming leaders we will have the true leadership that alone can carry society to its potential heights.

* * *

The race is the beginning and the end of Rosenberg's thought. Without race the myth is impossible for it would be without roots. This is the end toward which all other values and actions are directed. It is the final and supreme value. It is one and immutable. Our individual being and value are determined by our membership and participation in our race.

The grave problem with Europe in mid-century was its rejection of the idea of race and its willingness to accept miscegenation. Greece, Rome and France declined because they did not appreciate the value of pure Nordic blood. They prostituted the value of race and permitted alien blood to take over, bit by bit, until the Nordic blood was so diluted that it could not recognize its own worth and importance.

Race for Houston Chamberlain was an artificial creation. One begins with "good stock" from whatever source. Then one keeps the stock pure from outside contamination while mixing it thoroughly over a period of generations. The race that results from this process may be good or bad. One cannot predict because it is the end product, not the components, that counts. One should begin with superior stock, but Chamberlain admits that he cannot tell good raw material from bad and has no idea where one gets the good stock.

The term "Aryan" applies to any superior race irrespective of color, facial structure, body shape, hair coloration and so on. The one Aryan seeks out his superior counterpart in other lands and recognizes him not from his physical appearance but from the nature of his civilization and culture. Even if one could prove that there had never been such an Aryan race anywhere it was Chamberlain's intent that there would be one in the future. An Aryan race is thus produced in Chamberlain much like the hit and miss breeding of horses. One is never quite certain what the winning stallion will look like, but it can be bred selectively from "good stock." No two superior horses need look alike.

In Rosenberg race is an eternally existing thing. A Nordic man is an eternal symbol of racial superiority, and cannot be bred from Chinese, Hebrews, Indians, Arabs, Mediterranean or Alpine types. He will have no true counterpart anywhere else in the world. Should he disappear into a racial melting pot he could never be refabricated out of the mongrel product that the interbreeding of races produces.

The Nordic type predominated in most European civilizations and even on some Near East and Eastern cultures. The Varangian overlords developed Kievian civilization in the Ukraine until subdued by the Mongols. Then the race was absorbed by that and other alien blood. The Nordic man appeared as the leaders of pre-Socratic Greece, but subsequent race

mixing with Alpine, Mediterranean and Asiatic types ended their rule and Greece declined. The Nordic type also developed true Roman civilization, but was absorbed by the Near Eastern-Jewish-Etruscan races. Rome then fell, but the Nordic blood was so dissipated that it made little difference. The die was cast once Rome granted citizenship to non-Nordics, said Rosenberg.

The Nordic race once existed in Eastern Europe, but here again, it was intermixed with a variety of other races, including Magyars, Slavs, Mongols, Jews and so on. If the Germans had survived in our time as overlords without mixing then this area might have continued to have a civilization as it had had earlier in world history. But Rosenberg believed that it was lost and the area could only be used as land suitable for depopulization and resettlement.

France, too, had a Germanic population. Wars ravaged the race and resettlement was accomplished by Alpine-Mediterranean types along with later waves of blacks, Jews and other racial groups. France was of particuliar concern to Rosenberg for he saw it as an archetype of what was, in the 1920's, happening to Germany. If the trend was not reversed the chaos that marked France would be the earmark also of Germany and Great Britain. England was at the same crossroads as Germany and it, too, had to decide how to plot its future course. It was not a lost cause as was France. There was, thus, a natural racial alliance possible with Britain.

Should Germany and Great Britain lose the battle for racial protection, all would be lost for all time. We must bear in mind that substantial difference between Rosenberg and Chamberlain. In the latter, the race could emerge anew at any time. Regeneration was possible within any civilization that would isolate itself for generations and permit the pot to boil. In Rosenberg, race was a one time event. It could not spontaneously regenerate out of racial chaos.

So long as a basic Nordic racial group remained mostly intact it could renew its racial consciousness and its commitment to its supreme values. It could repopulate areas lost to other races. It could struggle upward under the leadership of type-forming individuals. But it could not remake itself, as it were, *ex nihilo*. As the proverb suggests, one cannot make a purse from a sow's ear nor a race from a group of mongrels. Alien inferior blood could not, for Rosenberg, be purgated from the mongrel groups and a purified race produced, as might be done in the cattle barns or horse stables as in Chamberlain.

Up to a point, the Nordic race could absorb a certain amount of alien blood. It could tolerate more than most races because its racial will was stronger than other racial wills. Its inner light, its guiding principles and its supreme values could protest against a moderate incursion of alien blood. But once the point wherein a society is overwhelmed is reached we will have come to the end of the line and there can be no salvation. The end of mankind and history will be at hand.

* * *

There is, also, an anti-race. The existence of *race* necessarily suggests that possibility. The anti-race is to be found in the Hebrews. The Nordic race was creative, incisive, reflective, open, honest and loyal. The anti-race, in Rosenberg, is precisely the opposite.

Its origins are shrouded not in Myths but in lies. It began with the idea of creation of the world out of nothing and it ended with nothing that is human, i.e., race-oriented. It taught that its god, Jehovah (Yaweh) created a superior race to serve him and he cheated other races to serve the Jews.

It taught a god who created a perfect world and who then constantly intervenes to alter what he created. All intervention benefits the Hebrews. That god took from other peoples and gave to the Jews, as in the case of the Promised Land which was already populated by other nations. That occurred despite the constant betrayal of Jehovah by his people from start to finish, from the Exodus to the occupation of the new homeland.

It was a race that taught nothing of freedom but rather extolled the values of slavery. It taught lies, as in the case where Jacob told the pharaoh that his wife was his sister. It was a race that denied others participation in their religion, saying that only the Jews could be the people of God. It was a race that taught punishment without crime, as in the case of Esau and Isaac; and it taught crime without punishment, as in the case of stealing others' land without claim, justification or compensation. These were among the charges Rosenberg threw at the ancient Hebrew "anti-race."

Since the destruction of their temple in Jerusalem, the Jews have wandered as parasites on the rest of the Western world. They have, according to the *Myth of the 20th Century*, contributed nothing while sapping the wealth and strength of their host nations. There is no symbiotic relationship established wherein each party provides something useful to the other; it is purely a parasitic relationship that takes but does not give.

The anti-race is of Asiatic origin and learned there the value of magic and ritual in controlling others. It devised such a magic system with its religion. Theology proved to be useful to the powerful elements in keeping control over the masses and it was only natural that, through such perfected magic, it expanded its control over others. Christianity, as taught in St. Paul and those under his Jewish spell, offered a mechanism for world-wide domination.

Like Houston Chamberlain, Rosenberg insisted that there was not one shred of true, historical evidence that Jesus was Jewish or that his true message has come down to us today. There are bits and pieces spread throughout the New Testament that suggest that Jesus was a Nordic type-forming figure whose true message can, in the large, be discovered and thus related to classic Germanic values. All else is the magical production of the same Jewish-Middle Eastern-Babylonian theology that subverted Rome and controlled the Hebrew masses.

The basic assumption Rosenberg made is as follows: Jesus taught an Aryan pride in self and in self becoming its potential. He had a justified anger against those who would prostitute the idea of God. He wanted to move the race ahead, excluding those of alien groups. The message was not understood by, or understandable to, those to whom it was delivered because they had never been free. Jesus had tried to teach them that the Kingdom of God was within man, that is, to be discovered inwardly through a right ordering of values. There was not truth to external magic, but he made the fundamental mistake of attracting the disciples by using magical tricks. These they understood but could not rise above that level.

St. Paul stumbled on what was but one of many non-Hebrew, non-Roman religious sects and saw the opportunity to alter what was. The followers were totally bewildered by promises of inner enlightment and the spiritual inner awakening Jesus promised. They were probably Jews, Rosenberg reasoned, and thus unable to understand anything but magic and material, external things. Paul gambled on the new theology. By subtly twisting the words of Jesus he could make him the Messiah who taught submission to the Jewish theology. Judaism would remain the religion of the initiates, of the Hebrews. They would control the Gentiles by controlling their religion. After all, the time was right to offer non-Hebrews some sort of opportunity to partake of the Jewish vision of an afterlife. Only the initiates, the Jews, would know that all was lies and deceit.

Simultaneously, the Arians became a threat for they taught the truer version of Christ's message. That sect had some Asiatic overtrappings, but it was fundamentally non-Jewish. Its theology had to be altered so

that it appeared to be ridiculous and then it could be, and was, suppressed. Still, some of the Arian heresy survived, if, again, in imperfect form.

The Roman Church grew, but under non-Hebrew leadership. The leaders after Peter learned how to continue to build a magical system that became a great influence over the masses. Jewish-Christian theology, as found in Paul, remained useful. In short, that church beat the Jews at their own game and with their own instrument, but, in doing so, succumbed to the Jewish philosophy.

The anti-race was denied full control of its mass-control religion, but it remained an influence in the West. The perplexing problem remained. The Jews were "Christ killers" but they were also "the Chosen People." St. Paul was the Jew Saul and he wrote to the Hebrews, but the Jews were still not Christian. Nonetheless, the Jews were still the center of history, quite clearly. They were neither part of Christendom nor wholly heathen.

The church of the Middle Ages did not choose to exterminate the Jews, but neither did it tolerate them in the cities. It confined them to ghettoes, and it limited them to certain professions. Anti-Christian writings and other attacks on Christianity were attributed to the Jews. Still, the Scholastics and the Popes would not accept a decisive course of action against them.

The ghetto mentality and the separatism of the Middle Ages remained in much of Central Europe through the inter-war period. Liberation was permitted and the Jews were emancipated. Religious anti-semitism was nearly at an end. What ensued was political anti-semitism.

* * *

Once Christianity was discovered to have Jewish roots and this was cast against the race-anti-race dichotomy, anit-semitism was viewed more broadly. It was essentially unimportant that the Jews killed Christ. It was important that the Jews sought, in one way or another, to dominate the Nordic race and the West generally.

The Jews, Rosenberg concluded, had come, by the beginning of the 19th century, to realize that Christainity had failed as a tool for the control of the West. A new tool was needed. Indeed, two seemingly disparate tools emerged simultaneously: capitalism and Marxism. The one had Gentile origins but could be manipulated by Jewish capital. The other was merely a form of state capitalism, controlled still by vested Jewish interests. It mattered little which one triumphed in any given country. In Russia it was Marxism and in most other areas it was capitalism. Both were merely two sides of the same coin.

Both communism-Marxism and capitalism were post-industrial ideologies. Both assumed the mass concentration of labor and industry in large urban areas. Both were antivolk, and internationalist in outlook. Both were only falsely nationalistic. Both assumed the continued existence of economic man in contradistinction to whole, inwardly-directed man. Both were materialistic and anti-spiritual in values and in preferred life-style. Neither gave man what he needed: a feeling of belonging. That could come only through, with and by nationalistic, volk-based, racially sound anti-materialistic ideology.

The term *plutocracy* is often associated with the Rosenberg critique of pro-large industrial societies, especially those that have a capitalistic economic system. The term, or even a rough equivalent, is not found in *The Myth of the 20th Century* anywhere, yet it is implied frequently. It is a negative value term which expresses disgust and contempt for a system of economic exploitation of the workers by large finance and capital. Rosenberg,of course, sees such exploitation as the result of Jewish control and of the inculcation of Jewish values in the capitalist system. Even if practiced by Gentiles, the plutocratic system shows, again, the conquest of the Nordic civilization of the Christian Church by St. Paul and his Jewish value system.

Because capitalism sees only profits and the accumulation of capital as its supreme value, it is willing to risk race degeneration to acquire profit. Its imperialistic approach to other, non-white areas of the world increasingly permitted non-white subjects to enter white civilization. Race-mixing and mongrelization were the logical results of such policies. In the short run, capitalism may have conquered; in the long run the remainder of the world conquered Europe, especially France.

European nations exported an internationalistic brand of Christianity and taught that we are "all one in Christ Jesus" despite our memberships in various races. The volk-nationalistic ideas were plowed under and the new crop of internationalism of the spirit grew in its place. Other values were shared and alien ideas were imported and assumed to be in vogue for whites. Cults grew up around other racial philosophies and theologies. Old supreme values gave way to illogical alien supreme values.

Marxism was wholly materialistic. It made no bones about it. There is no spiritual realm and no god. It seeks an internationalism of proportions that shames even Christianity. It revives the ancient, Hither-Asian struggle between good and evil, but on a purely materialistic level. The

struggle is between capital and labor, proletariat and bourgeoisie. No other lines, such as racial boundaries, are important or are even considered.

Marxist communism holds out a false hope and promise to the working class. Its talk of a utopia on earth is pure rhetoric which hides the true nature of communism. It speaks of an earthly paradise, but neglects to say that this is available only to the Jewish leaders and their Asian allies. It takes men's minds off more crucial issues such as race-mixing and volk preservation. In short, Rosenberg sees communism as merely a different form of volk-nationalism exploitation. It still does nothing to restore a sane society or to preserve racial purity. Its leaders are the same *types* as the contemporary capitalist-plutocratic leaders.

* * *

Volk literally translates to "people." To assure clarity throughout the text we have left the German word as we did with mythos for myth. The reader thus knows precisely what we mean to say and what Rosenberg wished to convey. These terms are somewhat more precise than the usual English translations of them.

A culture, a society, a state and a race are interrelated with the volk concept. A volk ordinarily represents a precise sub-group of a race. We may speak, generically, of the Aryan or Nordic race, and precisely of the German volk. Occasionally, and in a somewhat imprecise way, Rosenberg speaks of a Nordic-volk concept. It is a term reserved almost exclusively for Nordic peoples, although on very rare occasions Rosenberg used it to describe concepts of the Chinese mythos or the Aryan-Indian mythos.

It is nearly redundant to use *volk* and *culture* together for each of the terms contains the essence of the other. Only a true Nordic-Aryan group produces true culture, with that perennial Chinese-Japanese exception. Volk is that portion of race that is culture-producing and culture-bearing. Volk is the product of civilization. It must carry the specific racial-blood ideals that give that group its identity and its essence.

A volk has a supreme value or values. Honor, freedom, race and myth are values for the Nordic-German. One cannot think of him without such an ethic. His moral philosophy is vital to his existence. But this is not the product of an existential search; it is the natural result of his participation in the volk idea. He is impelled toward these values by a force that cannot be given shape or form, but by a force that is nonetheless real, strong and vital. That force comes from the volk.

The volk concept relates to the kind of society that is acceptable to Nordic man. The society is necessarily nationalistic because it relates not to an international community but to that immediate community of one's racial brothers and sisters. It reinforces the feeling of racial pride and it repudiates anything that prostitutes the national will or values. It is the voice within man that compels him to resist offenses against the national honor, and to resist internationalistic ideologies.

The volk society seeks to preserve the ancient customs of the race. It is vitally interconnected with the history of the nation. It seeks to protect those things gained by the heroes of the past and to add to the glory of these acts and events. It works hand in glove with the type-forming leaders who create racial values, and it seeks to preserve their accomplishments. It thinks almost exclusively in terms of familiar points of reference which ground us in the state.

Rosenberg as minister of culture placed great emphasis on the practical applications of his theories. He cultivated folk festivals. The villagers of German towns were urged to wear medieval costumes and to use ancient symbols. They reconstructed folk customs, used folk art and made folk objects. Such activities were consistent with the teachings of the *Myth of the 20th Century*.

It was most important that the Germans learn that they had a folk history that was quite independent of Roman Christianity and of Jewish customs. Such a cultural rebirth would constantly reinforce all volkish ideas. This formed the basis of a nationalistic reawakening.

If Germany was to be reborn as a rural society the proper foundations had to be laid. Many generations had succumbed to an industrial-urban culture and to its capitalist-plutocratic ideology. No thought was given to the great, perhaps overwhelming, values of a rural society. The rural past had been forgotten. It was relegated to a position of "useless trivial information." Urban-industrial was modern, and thus correct; rural-folk was archaic, and thus incorrect. Such a mentality had to be altered, and the folk festivals were a beginning.

Rosenberg viewed the farmer as the backbone of the nation. He was the principal carrier of the volk ideal. But he was being moved off his farm and into the city, lured by plutocratic economic promises. His values changed from rural-spiritual to urban-materialistic. Once that regression was completed, he would accept the whole of French-Jewish decadence. He could accept red light districts and race-mixing and homosexuality and crime.

The moral reconstruction had to begin with the farmer. He, alone, still carried concepts of honor, spiritual freedom and racial pride in his bosom. If the effort failed among the farmers it could not possibly be expected to succeed among the long-time urbanites. The correct way to walk was shown by returning to a simpler, more racially conscious past. Only German volk would have any possible interest in re-enacting folk customs.

Once checked, the incursion of anti-racial values and Jewish ideals could be driven back and removed as a threat to the volk. A small number of Jews and other aliens might be kept as a warning to the volk of what could happen if racial consciousness were to be again lost. This was the subject of another separate essay, *"The Earth-Centered Jew Has No Soul,"* but the germinal idea is to be found in the *Myth.* Both the essay and the *Myth* agree that, by and large, the Jews would have to be removed if the volk were to survive and prosper.

The volk possesses a very strong racial will and it is heroic, but it is not aggressive. Such overt aggression is a part of the Hebrew soul and it pains, perhaps prostitutes, the Nordic soul to fight the Jew on his own level. Such a struggle cannot be a permanent factor in German life without bringing great harm to the volk. Thus, depopulation is the only acceptable alternative presented by Rosenberg to this dilemma.

Once the principal obstacle to German volkdom was removed the volkish ideals could be pursued. This would be accomplished by removing all alien, especially Jewish, types from German soil. Then the reinculcation of the traditional German values could proceed to success. The volk would become strong and the volkish ethic would wholly replace the plutocratic one.

* * *

The Roman Catholic Church presented yet another obstacle to the achievement of pure volkdom. Much of the *Myth of the 20th Century* was devoted to a discussion of the merits and demerits of that religion. We must clearly begin with that vital assumption which we have already suggested above: the Roman Catholic Church is fundamentally and essentially Pauline, hence, Jewish.

Piece by piece, Rosenberg tried to show that the Church was both administratively and ritually Near Eastern-Jewish-Etruscan-Roman and anti-Nordic. Its practices, its sacraments, dogmas and doctrines are, in his view, alien to the German spirit. They corrupt it and they undermine the national-state.

Rosenberg especially admired the Jesuit organization and its unity in the struggle against the forces of the Reformation. In the organization established by Ignatius Lloyola we find the whole story of the Counter-reformation in a nutshell. Rosenberg did not like what they did but he was wholly smitten by how they did it. He saw vital lessons for the New Germany in its administration and organization. Like Ignatius, Rosenberg was desperately seeking to stem a floodtide and to restore old values. It was not to be a struggle for the squeamish or the faint of heart, and thus we arrive at the Jesuit model. It constitutes a classic love-hate relationship.

Rosenberg rehashed all of the traditional anti-papist arguments. He spoke of the corruption of the men who held the office and of their continual search for temporal power. Like William of Ockham, Marsiglio of Padua and a host of others before him, he saw the papal interference in state affairs as destructive both of the emerging nationalism and of the papacy itself. It harmed all concerned both in the acquistion of power and the subsequent exercise of that power.

Later, the Church attempted to maintain itself by denying any sort of nationalistic expression, including the use of the vernacular in services, writings and, of course, in the Bible. Anything that served internationalism was valuable to the papacy and those things that were nationalistic were, *ipso facto*, evil, and had to be squashed. The Roman Church remained a major object to volk culture and to national unity. He argues that the Church especially feared Germany because its national spirit was great, its national will was strong and its native volk culture was non-Roman. Germany had produced great minds as well as great warrior-heroes who were prepared to stand for the German volk over and against the Roman papacy in far greater measure than any other nation.

He saw the Roman Church standing foursquare for internationalism, plutocratic capitalism, the exploitation of workers, and imperialism provided at least lip service was paid to the spread of Christianity. It was most anxious to broaden its appeal to non-white nations. It could accept a black Jesus or a yellow Madonna or brown saints and so on. Its outreach for converts knew no limits.

The Roman Church, was in every way, alien to the Nordic race and its volkish expressions. It grew with the mongrelized Roman, not the early Nordic Roman, state. Its rituals originated in Asia, not Nordic Europe. It was Jewish in origin and outlook, especially as interpreted by St. Paul. It had used all of its power, including the Inquisition, torture, burnings at the stake, and so on, to spread and maintain its alien viewpoints. The Roman Church would never be compatible with Nordic ideals or ideas.

The Roman Church had emphasized the passion of Christ and his suffering on the cross and the like. It never emphasized his pride in self and in his accomplishments. It spoke of his resignation to the will of the Father, not of his freedom. It spoke of his charity and love, not of his power and vitality. It taught virtues that conflicted at the most basic level with the Nordic virtues, and it suggested that the true Christ could never live with the German volk ethic. In short, Rosenberg would not accept the picture of a crucified Jew as his God.

* * *

Roman Christianity dominated much of art since the fall of Rome. It failed to develop along volkish-nationalistic lines. Rome had used art to convey its message, especially of the crucified Christ and his demand that the will of God, not of men or race, be done. Any deviation from the accepted line was condemned with all the power the papacy could muster. It had reinforced the Roman-Jewish anti-myth over and against the true mythos.

Few subjects interested Rosenberg more than art. That expression of the soul of man was type-forming and it was basic to the true meaning of society. If directed in the proper way, it led men into a direct contact with his milieu. If misdirected, it led men away from their natural state. It was man's highest achievement and Rosenberg planned to utilize its potential to the fullest in advancing the volkish state.

He noted with interest that Christ was depicted, more than occasionally, as a Nordic racial type. This was not the preference of the Roman Church with its Jewish roots. Art that was acceptable to Rome had to move toward a Jewish model and away from anything that smacked of possible Nordic origins. A new art, based on the Nordic legacy of a few type-forming artists of the anti-Jewish school, would move toward a Nordic heroic Christ. That would butress the Nordic volk ideal.

Germanic art is close to, but still different from, Nordic Greek art in the pre-contamination years. It seeks the ideals of beauty, heroism, courage, harmony, truth and so on. It rejects impressionism, cubism and similar modern art forms. These are incompatible with, and alien to, the Germanic volk culture. Rosenberg was concerned both with form and with subject. He was not so blatant as some of his contemporaries, notably Mussolini in Italy, in demanding that art show Hitler, SS, SA, and other political themes.

He did demand respect for the past and for type-forming heroes. He also demanded that heroes be depicted with Nordic features and that symbols of evil be shown with features of alien races, especially Jews. Art was to convey impressions of the mythos and of the volk. It was to reinforce the ethic and values reached elsewhere in his works.

Art, of course, included music, drama, sculpture, architecture, and literature. He provided an extensive critique in the *Myth* of the various inferior works in all fields. Most of these, of course, hold no interest for the contemporary reader. Few have passed the test of time, even for those who rejected the German mythos.

In architecture, Rosenberg remained true to his principles. No designs for skyscrapers and large buildings and cities figured into his scheme of things. His great interest was in adapting medieval and other early designs to contemporary use. Architecture had to support the new reconstruction along volkish lines.

* * *

We must now pause and take stock of Rosenberg as a political thinker. It is usual to try to categorize thinkers. He is an ultra-conservative in the sense of accepting the legacy of the past, adding to it, changing little, and passing it along to future generations. He is not a regressive or a reactionary in the sense that he wished to return wholly to a past and to merely reconstruct what had been.

He is, by his own admission, an enemy of the French Revolution and its child, liberalism. He makes much of the evils of liberalism both in terms of its denial of the past and its ties to plutocratic capitalism. He is, equally, the enemy of anarchism, since he accepts a strong state system and of traditional socialism. And, as we have seen, he opposed marxism.

Some have tended to cast both Rosenberg and Chamberlain into the old, aristocratic conservative mold. While he believes in an oligarchy of the talented and the superior, type-forming heroes, he does not accept a true aristocracy of name and title. He prefers an aristocracy of merit. He therefore rejected, necessarily, any form of democracy, save for rural, direct democracy. He cannot countenance parliamentary, party democracy.

His values are, by traditional Judeo-Christian standards, transvaluated. But their roots are ancient Nordic. It is not merely the curious, untrue, distorted history of a nineteenth century aristocratic conservative. The values are not merely derived from a Ludwig Jahn or other super-

nationalist of the previous century. They are not the lying tradition of a dreaming, poetic composer of the last century. They are, to the best of Rosenberg's ability to reconstruct, the new, yet old, myths of Nordic peoples built over uncounted centuries.

He shares the concern with other thinkers who based their systems on racial values that the white or Nordic or Aryan or Germanic race is now gasping its last breath. Rosenberg believed society could be reconstructed if direct action were to be taken against encroachments against Nordic racial values. But, like Spengler, he saw that the time was limited. He lacked Spengler's pessimism, but shared his grave concern. Put another way, he thought that there was one last, fleeting chance for Nordic civilization. If it failed, and he had to put all his trust in that one effort, there would be no second or third chance. Thus, he tried to win, and avoided the clear implications of failure in the *Myth of the 20th Century*.

One can offer many criticisms of the book. It rambles at times. It contains some of the most ponderous prose known to man. Parts of it deal with purely passing fads, especially in art fields. Parts are simply poor history. Overall, it is a massive and impressive work.

In my judgement, it is the first and most important book on Nazi philosophy. It contains the essence of the state and the directive power of its leaders. It projects in a concise way the new state that Rosenberg and the others wished to build. It is important to bear in mind that the Third Reich was a wholly uncompleted state. Its major aims and designs never left the drawing boards. In this, it is unlike any other major ideology.

Much of the book will appeal only to the German mind of the 1930s. It constantly reminded me of the movie, *Triumph of the Will*. Neither were really designed for export and both were aimed only at a specific audience. If a contemporary reader in America were to fail to respond to either it would not bother Rosenberg. Both were meant to be felt more than rationally analyzed or understood. Both were to leave more of an impression on the audience than is evident to the average reader today. The message is very difficult to bring to a contemporary audience in a different culture and operating under a different myth.

There is much of communism, democracy, liberalism, even fascism, to export to other cultures and nations. This is not so with Rosenberg's ideas. It was an ideology wholly fitted to one and only one society at one particular time. If Rosenberg were to be alive today he would probably agree that his book is not suited to any culture remaining.

James B. Whisker, Ph.D.

Professor of Political Science
West Virginia University
August 1980

Author's Introduction

All present day struggles for power are outward effects of an inward collapse. All state systems of 1914 have already collapsed even if in part they still formally exist. Collapsed also have social, church and ideological creeds and values. No highest principle, no supreme idea governs undisputed the life of peoples. Group struggles against group, party against party, national values against international dogmas, rigid imperialism against spreading pacifism. Finance with its golden meshes swallows states and peoples, economy becomes nomadic, life is uprooted.

The World War as the beginning of a world revolution in all domains has revealed the tragic fact that although millions sacrificed their lives, this sacrifice was to the advantage of forces other than those for which the armies were ready to die. The dead of the war were victims of a catastrophic epoch that had lost all its values, but at the same time—and this is something which begins to be grasped in Germany today, even if so far by few—the martyrs of a new dawn, of a new faith. The blood which died, begins to live. In its mystical sign the cells of the German folk soul renew themselves. Past and present suddenly appear in a new light and for the future there results a new mission. History and the task of the future no longer signify the struggle of class against class or the conflict between one church dogma and another, but the settlement between blood and blood, race and race, people and people. And that means: the struggle of spiritual values against each other.

However, the values of the race soul, which stand as driving forces behind this new image of the world, have not yet become a living consciousness. *Soul means race seen from within. And conversely, race is the external side of a soul.* To awaken the race soul to life means to recognize its highest value and under its dominance to allot to other values their organic position in the state, in art and in religion. That is the task of our century; to create a new human type out of a new view of life. And for this courage is needed; courage of each single individual, courage of the entire generation growing up, indeed of many following generations. For chaos has never been mastered by those without courage and a world has never been built by cowards. Whoever wishes to go forward, must therefore also burn bridges behind him. Whoever sets out on a great journey, must leave old household goods behind. Whoever strives for what is highest, must turn his back on what is lesser. And to all doubts and questions the new man of the coming first German Reich knows only one answer: I will triumph, alone!

Despite the fact that so many today agree with these words, nevertheless no community can as yet be established on the basis of the ideas and conclusions laid down in this work. These are personal avowals throughout, not points in the program of the political movement to which I belong. This has its own great special task, and as an organization must keep itself remote from disputes of a religious, church-political kind as well as from the obligation to a definite philosophy of art or a fixed style of architecture. Thus it can not also be made responsible for what is put forward here. Philosophical, religious, artistic convictions are only to be based on the prerequisite of personal freedom of conscience and that is the case here. The work, however, is not directed at persons who live and work happily and firmly-rooted within their own faith communities, but certainly at all those who, inwardly released from the latter, have still not fought their way forward to new ideological links. The fact that these already number millions lays obligations on every fellow fighter to help himself and other seekers through deeper reflection.

This work, the basic idea of which goes back to 1917, was already completed in fundamentals in 1925, but new everyday duties again and again held up its final appearance. Works of colleagues or opponents then demanded renewed attention to questions which had hitherto been put aside. Not for a moment do I believe that here a solution to the great themes placed before us by destiny has been achieved. But I certainly hope to have clearly posed questions and to have coherently answered

them as the foundation for the bringing about a day of which we all dream.

Alfred Rosenberg

Munich, February 1930

Concerning the Third Edition

The publication of this work immediately called forth the most violent arguments. Owing to my deliberate questions and sharpened outlines, attacks were to be expected. But if I am to be completely honest then I must say that I am astounded (but also overjoyed) at the concentrated hate I have encountered along with the unscrupulous distortion of what I have written, by the manner in which these attacks appeared as if by command. In particular, the wild unrestrained abuse by Roman circles has shown how deeply justified the assessment of the Roman-Syrian dogma in fact is in the present work. According to old established methods, certain conclusions and assertions were, of course, taken out of context from this extensive book and the "blasphemy," the "atheism," the "Wotanism" of the author were held out before the credible reader in the German Roman press and in pamphlets. The falsifiers omitted that I even went so far as to postulate Wagner's assertion that a work of art is the living representation of religion and the starting-point for the whole of Germanic art and its foundation. The great respect which is shown the founder of Christianity in the work was overlooked. It was deliberately concealed that my religious observations have the clear intention of viewing his great personality without the eternal distortions by various churches. It was omitted that I rendered Wotanism as a dead religious form (but naturally have respect for the Germanic character which gave birth to Wotan as well as Faust) and, in an unscrupulous manner, the

fantasy was concocted that I wished to reintroduce the "pagan cult of Wotan."In short, there was nothing which was not distorted and falsified; and what appeared correctly expressed in a literal sense received a completely different coloring by being taken out of context. The Roman press omitted entirely all historical—because unassailable—factual affirmations; all thought processes which led to a definite outlook were thoroughly distorted and the bases of the requirements presented were deliberately overlooked. The prelates and cardinals mobilized the "faithful masses" and Rome, along with atheistic Marxism, i.e. with the political support of the subhumans, conducted a war of annihilation against Germany, to the total sacrifice of the German Catholics and yet had the effrontery to suddenly chatter about a "Kulturkampf." The context of this work which according to form and content certainly stands above those of the everyday level, were not made into an objective, and therefore, to be welcomed, critique, but were utilized for the most desolate everyday conflicts. Not against myself alone—that would have left me indifferent—but also against the National Socialist movement to which I have belonged since its inception. Despite the fact that in the introduction and in the work itself I expressly declared that a political movement which includes diverse religious denominations could not solve questions of a religious or art-philosophical nature; that consequently my world-outlook as a creed was a personal one—in spite of all this—the obscurantists did everything in their power to divert attention from their political crimes against the German people and once again to lament about "religion endangered"; although true religion is endangered by nothing so much as by the systematic cultivation of Marxism by the Centre party under direction of the Roman prelates. The National Socialist movement is not concerned with exerting religious dogmatism, neither for nor against a particular denomination, but the fact that a man in the forefront of political life must *claim* the right to represent a religious conviction which runs contrary to that of Rome, reveals to what degree spiritual gagging has already been successful.

The admissibility of activity in the national camp is measured by its value to the Roman dogmatism, instead of such a presumption being seen as impossible from the start. An undoubtedly serious attempt to cleanse the personality of Christ from the non-Christian Pauline, Augustine and other additions, has as a consequence brought forth a one-sided fury among the ruling utilizers of the distortion of the spiritual figure of Jesus; not because high religious values were touched upon but because a position of political power attained through the spiritual anguish of millions is threatened by a potential proud awakening. Things

are now such that the Roman Church feels no fear before Darwinism and Liberalism because especially in the latter, it saw only intellectual attempts without community-shaping strength. But the nationalistic rebirth of German man, from whom the entanglements of the old values had fallen away through the upheaval of 1914-1918 appears as so dangerous because from it a type-forming power threatens to arise. The ruling priest caste only senses this from afar, and particularly it sees that this awakening makes efforts to strengthen everything noble and strong. Therefore its alliance with the Red sub-humanity has to be close. This will only alter when the German Front proves itself victorious; at that hour Rome will attempt as "friend" to achieve what it could not attain as an enemy. However, to pursue these possibilities does not lie within the scope of this book; it is concerned with the chiseling out of the actual spiritual types, hence about the man seeking to become self-conscious; an awakening of the feeling of value and the steeling of the character; of resistance in the face of all hostile enticements.

The uproar about my writings was all the more typical, since not a word was uttered to express my disassociation from the slandering of great Germans, such as has for long been the literary preoccupation of the Jesuits and their associates. The slandering was quietly furthered, of Goethe, Schiller, Kant, etc., and no objections were raised when the pacemakers of Rome saw their religious task in the hindrance of the formation of a German national state; when at Catholic pacifist gatherings it was demanded that German soldiers be refused a salute; when Catholic clergy dared to publicly deny the truth about the actions of the Belgian Franctireurs and to accuse German soldiers of murdering their comrades in order to have an excuse for the persecution of Belgians; when the German people's army was wrongly accused in the French propaganda of desecration of altars and the host committed in Belgian churches. No bishops and cardinals have protested against these deliberate slander of what is German, of its fallen and living defenders; but there certainly followed on the part of these same bishops and cardinals attack after attack upon German nationalism. And if the latter were pilloried it shows that the Roman political and religious groups were advancing *their own* national feeling.

The Roman Church in Germany cannot dispute its full responsibility for the *Volk*-destructive work of its numerous pacifist clergy, since in other cases where honorable Catholic priests found words of true German national will, they were excluded without further ado from free speech. Thus there exists a proven systematic political-ideological attempt to rob the German people of its pride in the defenders of the homeland of 1914,

to desecrate their memory and to drag into the muck the fiery will to protect *Volk* and Fatherland. To establish this requires the simplest truthfulness and how the faithful come to terms with their church authority is a matter of conscience. Things are not such that in order to silence awakening struggles they can pass off these undeniable facts as mere aberrations but courage is particularly necessary for defense against the politics of the highest church authorities. Whether those so awakening discern the entire ideological contrast or not must remain their own affair. What *is* important is that the serious will awakens to defend German national honor not only against Marxists but equally so, indeed even more sharply, against the Centre and its Church allies as the massive breeders of Marxism. An evasion of this point would merely reveal an un-German disposition.

I will not mention all the individual hostile voices. But the typically unscrupulous methods may be singled out in which the Jesuit Jakob Notges has the effrontery to assert that the protection of the mother tongue belongs to the "Catholic Order" although his Order in particular has been the most bloody opponent of the right to the mother tongue; that the love for *Volk* and Fatherland is demanded by "all great moral theologians" in which respect his Order in particular fights forever *against* German Nationalism! The Christian neighborly love of this gentleman finally unloads itself in the words: "This Balt is a culture-fighter, in the manner of a boxer. The poor man suffers from an incurable fear of St. Peter's Square, which finds its expression in raging and shouting." Then Hitler is advised to put me in a "straitjacket" since putting me on ice is no longer of use "because he has experienced the Russian winter too often."The furious unreasoned hatred by this Jesuit whose Roman sunstroke passes beyond every boundary is enlarged by other colleagues of his Order in the contrasting manner of combat. The Jesuit Koch, for example, tries to speak of a German race soul, calls the experience of life as this resounds from the Mythos, serious and honorable, in order in conclusion to celebrate Boniface as the greatest German! This form of hundred per cent falsification is something we will often meet in the future where there is the realization that incitement no longer helps; therefore, such "Germanic" attempts must also be treated with caution. The destruction of the German soul is always seen as the goal both of the apostles of incitement as well as of the handyman artisans of the *Societas Jesu* and its fellow protagonists—yesterday, today and tomorrow.

My book has also called forth a violent upheaval in Evangelical (Protestant) circles. Countless articles in newspapers and journals prove that it clearly touched upon very sensitive spots. At Evangelical synods, at congresses of the Evangelical League, the *Mythos* often stood at the

center point of debate and many pamphlets of Protestant theologians give evidence that a struggle of values has become renewed and deep in the midst of Lutheranism. My prediction that the Evangelical Church would behave in an anxious manner toward the new religious feeling—similar to Rome with its dogmatic base towards the Reformation—has unfortunately been confirmed. The Theologians and Professors fulminating against my work made it easy for them to be seen as being in full possession of "Evangelical truth"; they simply confirmed the heretical nature of my assertions, praised "national feeling" (without obligation) and were delighted to be able to establish (apparent) inaccuracies and then to reject these.

It was reported to me that at one of these synods after just such a report, an honest white-haired clergyman stood up and declared that he could not acknowledge what had been said. It was hats off before this honorable man! Irrespective of whether his search reveals the same conclusions as mine, every genuine fighter will show respect to the searching opponent but not to the old guardians of dogma who believe that they must at all costs hang on to their tenuous positions.

In discussion with learned theologians I was further able to establish the following: they conceded to me that the evaluation of ancient history from the race-soul aspect was correct. But when I drew the conclusion that the Jews must then necessarily also have their own completely determined character—their blood-linked idea of God—that consequently this Syrian life and spiritual form did not concern us in the least, then the Old Testament dogma arose like the great wall between us; suddenly, the Jews appeared as an exception among peoples. In all seriousness the cosmic God was said to be identical with the dubious spiritual assertions of the Old Testament! Hebrew polytheism was elevated to a model of monotheism, and no deeper a knowledge had come to Lutheran theology from the original magnificent Aryan-Persian idea of the world and the cosmic comprehension of God. In addition there appeared the revering of Paul, an arch sin of Protestantism, against which Lagarde, as is known, attacked by the entire official theology of his day, fought in vain.

The Protestant theologians everywhere submit, with universal agreement to the anti-*Volkish* view of the world; the arrogant assertion of the Roman Church that the racial evaluation of peoples signifies un-Christian "idolatry." These gentlemen overlook, however, that the exceptional position which they attribute to the Jews, represents nothing other than idolatry of the parasitic Judaic manipulators, always hostile to us. Also typical is the answer which D. Strathmann made in a leaflet to the criticism that the churches should concern themselves with the German people and in view of the latter's impoverishment, not bother about

Negro missions: "as if that were their task! For the sake of the racial cult they are to deny the humanitarian task of the missions!" The race and soul of the Negroes is regarded—along with the good Jews—as being more important than the nation to which one has the honor to belong. This appears to them as self-evident as they prefer likewise to overlook that this glorification of Jewry together with the unleashing of Jewish impulses, has caused the impoverishment of our culture and our politics against which the present direction of Protestantism has proven itself incapable of successfully fighting, particularly owing to the idolatry of Jewish ways.

It is disconcerting if the present representatives of Evangelical theology are so un-Lutheran as to represent the views in which Luther was understandingly still caught up as permanently fixed dogmas. Luther's great deed was, in the first instance, the smashing of the exotic priestly idea and secondly, the Germanizing of Christianity. The awakening of Germany, however, also led after Luther to Goethe, Kant, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Lagarde and today approaches its full flowering with powerful strides. When D. Kremers, a leader of the Evangelical League, declares in an article that the *Mythos* is "swallowed" by academic youth, then he shows that he is aware how a powerfully new life is already active in the young Protestant generation. Is it not more important now to promote this spiritual *Volk* rooted life than to hang on inwardly to long fallen dogmatic idols? This young generation nevertheless wishes nothing more than to see the cosmic personality of the founder of Christianity in its actual greatness without those falsifying additions with which Jewish zealots like Matthew, materialistic rabbis like Paul, African jurists like Tertullian or unprincipled crossbreeds like Augustine have presented to us as the most frightful spiritual ballast. The young wish to grasp the world and Christianity from their own essence, from Germanic values; to assert their self-apparent right to this world but which (especially today) must be regained with hard struggle.

If the ruling church orthodoxy is unable to grasp all this it will nevertheless not alter the course of things; at most, only be able to make them hesitant. A great era would have then once more encountered a petty, self-righteous generation. However, this coming time affirms both the Strasburg cathedral as well as the Wartburg and denies the arrogant Roman Centre just as it does the Jerusalem Old Testament. It draws more strength from the roots of Germanic drama, its architecture and music, than from the comfortless tales of the Jewish people. It recognizes much deep *Volkish* symbolism within the Catholic church and links the latter with the truthfulness of what is truly Lutheran. It unites with a great

encompassing of race-soul world outlook all that is individualistic to the full-blooded organism of a German essence.

The young Evangelical priest must move forward since a soul-crippling training does shackle him as with Catholic priests until the time ripens when from the latter also, Germanic rebels arise and the work of the monk Roger Bacon and the monk Eckehart lead to the freedom of practical life just as the other great martyrs of the West also lived, suffered and fought in the past.

On the part of "National" circles, the *Mythos* was greeted with deadly silence out of fear of the Catholic Zentrum (Centre Party). Only a few risked joining themselves to its train of thought. The negative judgment from this camp, however, always consisted of claiming that I wished to be a "founder of a new religion" but that in this respect I had failed. In the chapter on the *Volk* church, however, I have rejected this allegation in advance; what I am really concerned with, along with the foundation of the racial study of history, is to place in antithesis to one another the values of soul and character of the different races and peoples and systems of thought; to establish the organic order of rank of these values for what is German and to pursue the Germanic will in all domains. The problem is thus: To introduce an orientation of soul and spirit against chaotic confusion; to reveal the prerequisites of a general rebirth. The value of my work is to be measured by this act of will and by criticism of what I have not undertaken to carry out, which will be the task of a reformer who will arise from the longings of a clearly adjusted generation.

Voices in other countries are throughout more objective than the echoes from circles needing reform in Germany. But more important than all this are the countless expressions of agreement from all countries of the world, above all from those Germans who have become conscious of the present great spiritual hour of destiny for both Germany and the peoples of the West. The questions which confront us, also confront other nations, and only a very grave destiny compels us to a more honest account, drives us to step out upon a new path because otherwise, with political collapse, spiritual catastrophe must also appear, and the German people as a real people will vanish from history. However, true rebirth is never a matter of political power, even less than a matter of "economic reorganization" as empty Marxist heads arrogantly assert, but it signifies a central experience of the soul, the recognition of a highest value. If this experience is continued millionfold from man to man, finally, if the united strength of the people places itself before this inward transformation, then no power in the world will be able to prevent the resurrection of Germany.

The Democratic-Marxist camp had at first attempted by dead silence to deny the appearance of this work. However, it was then forced into declaring its attitude. These people have now attacked the "fake Socialism," such as was apparently taught in my work to the detriment of the workers. The "true" socialism of social democracy clearly surfaces in that there is an untroubled continuation of the literal enslavement of an entire people over many decades through continuation of the pawning of all still existing values with their subjugation under the dictates of international finance. True "Socialism" further consists in that the decent creative German people are delivered into the hands of degenerate theatre and film propaganda, which knows only three heroic types: the prostitute, the pimp and the criminal. The "true" socialism of the Marxist leadership, in effect, consists in that the little man is flung into jail for a small misdemeanor whereas the big swindler walks away free, just as hitherto this had been the cultivated view of the most influential circles around democracy and social democracy. The whole of Marxism has revealed itself, as was unavoidable, as disintegrating of every organic community in favor of alien nomadic instincts. It must therefore regard a new foundation and the taking root of such *Volk* socialistic style-forming feeling as an attack upon its existence.

Marxism and Liberalism today find themselves along the entire front in a disorderly rearguard action. For many decades it was regarded as particularly progressive to speak only of "humanity," to be world citizens and to reject the racial question as retrogressive. Now all these illusions are not only politically disposed of but the ideology upon which they are based has become brittle and it will not be long until it collapses completely in the souls of those who, although misled, are still to some degree healthy. Closely pressed, nothing is left to "scientific Marxism" other than to attempt the proof that Karl Marx also expressly recognized the influence of *Volk* and race on world events! This mission to incorporate the blood-awakening of the German worker which can no longer be stemmed, into Marxist orthodoxy which for decades has furiously fought the "racial delusion," was undertaken, among others, by "Socialistic Education." —an attempt which in itself characterizes the inward catastrophic spiritual collapse even if after the admission with gnashed teeth of the justification of the racial standpoint, is the general assertion that Marx rejected "racial fetishism." What *is* self-evident, is that otherwise he would have had to depart for Syria as a teacher—where he rightly belongs. To recognize this and to uproot Marxist materialism and financial-capitalist backing from German life as an alien Syrian-Jewish plant, is the great mission of the new German workers movement which as a result will win the right to the leadership of their own future.

We on our side do not deny very diverse influences: Landscape and climate and political tradition; but all this is outweighed by blood and the blood-linked character. Things evolve around the reconquest of this order of rank.

To re-establish the ingenousness of healthy blood, is perhaps the greatest task upon which man can set himself today. At the same time, this affirmation gives evidence of the sad situation of the body and the spirit, that such a deed has become a life-necessity. A contribution to this great coming act of liberation of the 20th century is what the present book intends to be. Not only the shaking up of many awakening men but also of opponents is the desired result. I hope that the confrontation between a newly arising world and the old forces will take on more and more offshoots, penetrate into all domains of life, always fructifying anew, producing more blood-linked pride until the day when we can stand on the threshold of the fulfillment of our longing for a German life, until the hour when all wellsprings will unite into one great river of a Nordic-German rebirth.

That is a dream worth being taught and lived. And this experience and this life alone are the reflections of a presaged eternity—the mysterious mission of this world into which we were placed in order to become what we are.

Alfred Rosenberg

Munich, October 1931

500 Thousand

In December, 1936, the printing of the *Mythos* exceeded half a million copies. That is something which can no longer merely be described by the words "a wonderful book" as it reveals far more that my work has become a part of the life of the German people and has been taken as an inward possession by millions who had the courage to throw away from themselves what was dead in order to break courageously toward a new future.

I have been through the book once more and have had to alter virtually nothing. Formulations which were laid down at the time of the most bitter

political struggle, have revealed their deep justification for the present. Only in the domain of actual state-political activities have some things been surpassed at one place and the elaborations have been made appropriately.

The ideas laid down in the *Mythos* have been established in later speeches which are summarized in two volumes: *Blood and Honor*, and *Shaping of the Idea.* I have answered my Roman opponents in the pamphlet: *To the Obscurantists of our Times* (edition of 680,000).

The decisive transformation of soul and spirit completes itself throughout Germany. In its service, the *Mythos of the 20th Century* stands today in the foremost ranks.

Alfred Rosenberg

Berlin, January 1937

Contents

Preface ix
Introduction to the English Edition xxix
Author's Introduction il
Concerning the Third Edition liv
500 Thousand lxi

Book One: *The Conflict of Values*

I. Race and Race Soul 2
II. Love and Honor 80
III. Mysticism and Action 128

Book Two: *Nature of Germanic Art*

I. Racial Aesthetics 169
II. Will and Instinct 197
III. Personality and Style 211
IV. The Aesthetic Will 237

Book Three: *The Coming Reich*

I. Mythos and Type 281
II. The State and the Sexes 300
III. Volk and State 327
IV. Nordic-German Law 353
V. Church and School 376
VI. A New System of State 402
VII. The Essential Unity 428

Index 445

Book One
THE CONFLICT OF VALUES

I am only King as long as I am free

—Frederick the Great

I. Race and Race Soul

TODAY one of those epochs is beginning in which world history must be written anew. The old images of the human past have faded, the outlines of leading personalites are distorted, their inner driving forces falsely interpreted, their whole nature for the most part totally misjudged. A youthful life-force—which also knows itself to be age-old—is impelled toward form; an ideology, a *Weltanschauung*, has been born and, strong of will, begins to contend with old forms, ancient sacred practices, and outworn standards. This means no longer historically but fundamentally; not in a few special domains but everywhere; not only upon the heights but also at the roots.

And this sign of our times is reflected in a turning away from absolute values, that is to say, in a retreat from values held to be beyond all organic experience, which the isolated ego once devised to create, by peaceful or violent means, a *universal* spiritual community. Once, such an ultimate aim was the "Christianizing of the world" and its redemption through the Second Coming of Christ. Another goal was represented by the Humanist dream of "Mankind." Both ideals have been buried in the bloody chaos of the Great War and in the subsequent rebirth out of this calamity, despite the fact that now one, and now the other, still find increasingly fanatical adherents and a venerable priesthood. These are

processes of petrifaction and no longer of living tissue: A belief which has died in the soul cannot be raised from the dead.

Humanity, the universal church, or the sovereign ego, divorced from the bonds of blood, are no longer absolute values for us. They are dubious, even moribund, dogmas which lack polarity and which represent the ousting of nature in favor of abstractions. The emergence in the nineteenth century of Darwinism and Positivism constituted the first powerful, though still wholly materialistic, protest against the lifeless and suffocating ideas which had come from Syria and Asia Minor and had brought about spiritual degeneracy. Christianity, with its vacuous creed of ecumenicalism and its ideal of *humanitas*, disregarded the current of red-blooded vitality which flows through the veins of all peoples of true worth and genuine culture. Blood was reduced to a mere chemical formula and "explained" in that way. But today an entire generation is beginning to have a presentiment that values are only created and preserved where the law of blood still determines the ideas and actions of men, whether consciously or unconsciously. At the subconscious level, whether in cult or in life, man obeys the commands of the blood, as if in dreams or, "according to natural insight," as a happy expression describes this harmony between nature and culture. But culture, with the growth of all subconscious activity and of expanding consciousness and knowledge, becomes more and more intellectual and ultimately engenders not creative tension but, in fact, discord. In this way, reason and understanding are divorced from race and nature and released from the bonds of blood. The ensuing generation falls victim to the individualistic system of intellectual absolutes and separates itself more and more from its natural environment, mixing itself with alien blood. It is through this desecration of the blood that personality, people, race and culture perish. None who have disregarded the religion of the blood have escaped this nemesis—neither the Indians nor the Persians, neither the Greeks nor the Romans. Nor will Nordic Europe escape if it does not call a halt, turning away from bloodless absolutes and spiritually empty delusions, and begin to hearken trustingly once again to the subtle welling up of the ancient sap of life and values.

Once we recognize the awesome conflict between blood and environment and between blood and blood as the ultimate phenomenon beyond which we are not permitted to probe, a new and, in every respect, richly colored picture of human history becomes manifest. This recognition at once brings with it the knowledge that the struggle of the blood and the

intuitive awareness of life's mystique are simply two aspects of the same thing. Race is the image of soul. The entire racial property is an intrinsic value without relationship to material worshippers who apprehend only discrete events in time and space without experiencing these events as the greatest and most profound of all secrets.

Racial history is therefore simultaneously natural history and soul mystique. The history of the religon of the blood, however, is conversely the great world-story of the rise and fall of peoples, their heroes and thinkers, their inventors and artists.

Today, historical vision can see deeper into the past than was imaginable at an earlier time. The monuments of all peoples now lie spread out before us, excavations of the very oldest examples of pictorial art allow a comparison of the driving forces of cultures, the myths from Iceland to Polynesia have been collected, the treasures of the Mayans in great part unearthed. In addition, modern geology enables us to draw maps as things were tens of thousands of years ago. Underwater exploration has raised solid masses of lava from great depths of the Atlantic Ocean, the summits of suddenly submerged mountains in whose valleys cultures had once arisen before one—or many—frightful catastrophes destroyed them. Geographers depict for us continental masses between North America and Europe whose fragments we see in Iceland and Greenland. In one area of the far North (Novaya Zemlya) old water lines are revealed more than 100 meters above the present ones. These suggest that the North Pole has shifted and that a much milder climate once prevailed in the Arctic. All in all, the old legends of Atlantis may appear in a new light. It seems far from impossible that in areas over which the Atlantic waves roll and giant icebergs float, a flourishing continent once rose above the waters and upon it a creative race produced a far-reaching culture and sent its children out into the world as seafarers and warriors. But even if this Atlantis hypotheses should prove untenable, a prehistoric Nordic cultural center must still be assumed.

We have long since been forced to abandon the theory of an *identical* origin of myths, art, and religious forms among all peoples. On the contrary, the strongly substantiated proof of the frequent traveling of sagas from people to people and their taking root among many different groups, shows that the majority of basic myths have a fixed point of radiation—their place of creation. Thus, in their outward form, they are only comprehensible on the basis of a completely distinct point of origin and the migrations of races also become a certainty in the most prehistoric times. The solar myth, with all its ramifications, did not arise

spontaneously as "a stage of general development," but was born where the appearance of the sun must have been a cosmic event of profoundest significance, that is, in the far North. Only there would the year be sharply divided into two halves, and only there would the sun represent a certainty in man's innermost being of the life-renewing, primal creative substance of the world. And so today the long derived hypotheses becomes a probability, namely that from a nothern center of creation which, without postulating an actual submerged Atlantic continent, we may call "Atlantis," swarms of warriors once fanned out in obedience to the ever-renewed and incarnate Nordic longing for distance to conquer and space to shape.

These currents of Atlantic men moved by water in their swan and dragon ships into the Mediterranean and to Africa; by land over Central Asia to Kucha, perhaps even to China; over North Africa to the south of our own continent.

Ahura Mazda says to Zoroaster, "Only once in the year does one see the rising and setting of stars and sun and moon; and the inhabitants hold to be a day, what is a year." This must be for the Persian God of light a distant memory of the Nordic homeland, for only in the far north do day and night each last six months.

The *Mahabharata* reports of the Indian hero, Arjuna, that during his visit to the mountain of Meru, the sun and moon daily passed around from left to right. Such an idea could never have originated in the tropical south, for only in the far north does the sun disc roll along the horizon. A prayer is also address to the Indian Adityas: "May the long darkness not come over us," and it is complained of bright Agni that he had "tarried too much in the long darkness," all of which can only be attributed to the long hyperborean night.

Together with these primeval Aryan-Atlantic memories appear those cult allegories, costumes, carvings which are understandable only in terms of Nordic origin. In pre-dynastic Egypt, we find the Nordic boat with its swan neck and trefoil. But the rowers are the later-ruling Amorites, already recognized by Sayce as fair-skinned and blue-eyed. They once traversed North Africa as strictly homogeneous hunter clans which gradually subdued the entire land. They then migrated somewhat further, across Syria and toward (the future site of) Babylon. The Berbers, among whom even today one finds light skins and blue eyes, do not go back to the Vandal invasions of the fifth century A.D. but to the prehistoric Atlanto-Nordic human wave. The Kabyle huntsmen, for example, are to no small degree still wholly Nordic (thus the blond

Berbers in the region of Constantine form 10% of the population; at Djebel Sheshor they are even more numerous.) The ruling stratum of the ancient Egyptians reveals significantly finer features than the subject people. These "Hamites" are apparently a crossbreed of the Atlanteans and the negroid aboriginal population. Suddenly, around 2400 B.C., there appear reliefs of men with fair skin, reddish-blond hair and blue eyes, those "blond Libyans" of whom Pausanias later reports. In the tomb paintings at Thebes, we find "four races of Egypt" represented: Asiatics, Negroids, Libyans, and Egyptians. The last are depicted with reddish pigmentation; the Libyans, on the other hand, are always shown bearded, with blue eyes and white skins. Pure Nordic types are shown on a grave of the Senye dynasty, in the woman on the pylon of Horemheb at Karnak, by the swanboat people on the temple relief at Medinet-Habu and by the Tsakkarai who founded "Phoenician" sea travel. Light-skinned men with golden hair are shown on the tombs at Medinet-Gurob. In the most recent (1927) excavations in the Mastabas at the pyramid of Cheops, the "Princess and Queen Meres-Aneh" (2633-2564) were found depicted with blond hair. The legendary and myth-surrounded Queen Nitokris is likewise always said to have been blonde.

All these are racial memories of a prehistoric Nordic tradition in North Africa.

The Amorites founded Jerusalem and they formed the Nordic weft in later Galilee, that is, in the "pagan region" whence Jesus is said to have come. The Amorites were then augmented by the Philistines, who also brought to Syria hitherto unknown Nordic ship designs, with axe and trefoil as the stem symbols.

It is still uncertain where the prehistoric homeland of the Nordic race lies. As the South Atlanteans swarmed over North Africa and southern Asia, so the North Atlanteans must have carried the sun god from Europe to Mesopotamia, even to the Sumerians, whose yearly calendar had once begun on the day of the winter solstice. The most recent investigations in Iceland and Scotland indicate a possible Stone Age immigration. The ancient Irish ideal of beauty was of milk-white skin and blond hair. This was abandoned later with the arrival of a dark, round-headed race.

Much remains obscure. Perhaps only future investigation will be able to establish whether the oldest of cult symbols—the first rock drawings of the Stone Age—were also the basis for the pre-dynastic Egyptian linear script, and that other scripts in the world are also derived from this "Atlantic" symbolism. Whatever the results of future research, however, nothing can alter the one supreme fact that the march of world history has

radiated from the North over the entire planet, determining in vast successive waves the spiritual face of the world—influencing it even in those cases where it was to be halted.

These migration periods—the legendary march of the Atlanteans across North Africa, Persia and India, followed by the Dorians, Macedonians, and Italic tribes; the diffusion of the Germanic *Volkerwanderung*—culminated in the colonizing of the world by the Germanic West.

When the first great Nordic wave rolled over the high mountains into India, it had already passed through many hostile races. Instinctively, as it were, the Indo-Aryans separated themselves from the dark alien peoples they encountered. The institution of *caste* was the outcome of this instinctive aversion. *Varna* means *caste*, but it also means color. The fair Aryans thus linked themselves to an acceptable image of the human type, and created a gulf between themselves as conquerors and the black-brown natives of pre-Aryan India. According to this opposition of blood and blood, the Aryans evolved a world-view which, for depth and range, cannot be surpassed by any philosophy even today, although admittedly this was only after a long battle against the constantly intruding ideas of the racially inferior aborigines. The period, for example, which lies between the heroic songs of the Vedas and that of the Upanishads is one both of expansion and of a simultaneous struggle against sorcery and degenerate ecstacies. The sacrificial cult of spirits and gods had begun to infiltrate. The priest, with his sacred ladle and firebrand, was not immune to these magical ideas. Every touch of the hand, every gesture, acquired a mystical significance. As Deussen established, ritualism developed between the mythological and the philosophical periods. Prayer, which with the true Brahman was only a powerful elevation of the heart, became an incantation to compel the gods by magic. In the midst of this murky process, the Atman doctrine appeared to light a ray of hope. It was not "an act of psychological development," which would be utterly meaningless (even Deussen does not attempt to explain it) but represented a new awakening of the Aryan soul in the face of the superstitious and magical beliefs of the subjugated non-Aryans. This interpretation is at once confirmed when it is established that the great doctrine of the personal value of the spirit—devoid of magic and the demonic—originated in the courts of the kings and was diffused from the *warrior* caste. Although the Brahmans were later to become the teachers of the new idea of the essential Oneness of the world-soul and the individual soul, they were never able to conceal the origin of the new

concept. Thus it comes about that instruction concerning Atman is given by King Ajatactru to the Brahman Gargya Balake; by the war god. Sanatkumara, to the Brahman Narada; by King Pravahna to the Brahman Aruni. Thanks to this aristocratic reassertion, the un-Aryan magic cult retreated further and further and did not proliferate once more until later when racial decay overtook even the India of the Kshatriyas.

As a born master, the Indian felt his individual soul expand into the *Atman* which pervaded the entire universe and lived within his own breast as his innermost self. The concept of an impersonal nature, rich and virtually all-provident, could not divorce him from this metaphysical union. An active life, which was always demanded as an ineluctable duty of the world-renouncing thinker, gave place more and more to the aim of journeying into the universe of the soul. This transition to the pure light of knowledge led to the noble attempt to overcome nature through reason. There is no doubt that many Indians, as individual personalities and aristocrats, were successful in this quest. But for later men only the teaching remained, devoid of its vital racial prerequisite.

Soon the rich, blood-based meaning of *Varna* was entirely lost. Today it is only a division between technical, professional, and other classes and has degenerated into the vilest travesty of the wisest idea in world history. The later Indian did not comprehend the threefold significance of Blood, Self, and Universe. He saw only the last two. And he perished in the attempt at isolated contemplation of the Self and in racial pollution, whose modern products are wretched mongrels, seeking healing for their crippled existence in the waters of the Ganges.

After he had "overcome" the polarized ideas of self/universe by a rational choice in favor of the one part, the Indian monist also endeavored to eliminate the antithesis between them and violently to attain freedom through nature and master nature through freedom. He, therefore, was inclined to regard race and personality as being aspects of a higher concept and as illusionary. The late Indian monist came to see nature as something unreal—an evil dream. The only reality for him is the world-soul (Brahman) and its eternal reocurrence in the individual soul (Atman). With this turning away from nature in general, the once clear idea and concept of race became ever more hazy. Philosophic dogma uprooted instinct from its earthly basis. If the only reality is the world-soul and if Atman is essentially one with it, then individuality vanishes and an undifferentiated universal oneness is achieved.

The result was that Indian thought ceased to be creative. It grew rigid. The alien blood of the swarthy Sudras, who were now thought of as

equally valuable bearers of Atman, seeped in. Thus was destroyed the original concept of the identity of caste and race. Bastardization was inevitable. Serpent and phallic cults of the aborigines began to flourish and spread. Symbolic interpretations of the hundred-armed Siva, like creeping vines in the primeval forest, begin to appear in a horrible bastard art. Only at the courts of the kings were the old heroic songs still heard and the lyricism of such as Kalidasa and other, mostly unknown, poets still honored.

Shankara attempted a new refurbishing of Indian philosophy. But it was in vain. Through too deep an intake of breath, the arteries of the race were ruptured. Aryan blood flowed out and trickled away. Only here and there, where the dark soil of ancient India sucks it up, does it still fertilize. But it leaves only a cultivated philosophical and technical orthodoxy which, in its later insane distortion, rules Hindu life today.

We must not short-sightedly assert that the Indian first polluted his race and then surrendered his personality. It is rather the case that a metaphysical process took place and that this was manifested in a passionate yearning for the abolition of dualism as well as the reciprocally-conditioning lower forms of polarity.

Viewed from the outside, philosophical acceptance of an equation of Atman-Brahman engendered racial decay. In other cultures, this decay was not consequent upon the establishment of a pervasive philosophy but was, simply, the result of uninterrupted miscegenation among two or more races. In such cases the essential characteristics of the various races were neither elevated nor strengthened but ended in mutual annihilation.

From the sixth century (B.C.) on, Iran underwent a vast expansion by the Aryan Persians. Under Arshama, there arose one of the greatest personalities of Indo-European history, Spitama (Zoroaster, or Zarathustra). Concerned about the fate of the Aryan minority, he developed an idea which is only now beginning to revive in the Nordic West—protecting the race by endogamy within kin. But since the Aryan ruling aristocracy were sparsely scattered, Zoroaster tried to reinforce this imperative by creating an ideologically-bound community of faith. Ahura Mazda, the eternal god of light, became a cosmic idea—the divine protector of Aryans everywhere. He had no special abode or temple like the gods of the Orient and even of later Rome. He was simply the "holy whiteness" of perfection. His enemy is the dark Ahriman who is locked in struggle with him for world domination. This is a truly Nordic-Aryan concept of Zoroaster. In this struggle, we must fight on the side of Ahura Mazda (just as the Einheriar in Valhalla would fight for Odin against the

Fenris Wolf and the Midgard Serpent.) Man must not, therefore, withdraw into world-renouncing contemplation and asceticism. He must see himself as the struggling bearer of a world-preserving idea; he must arouse and arm all the creative powers of the human soul. Whether as a thinker or an active creator, man must always serve what is highest. Wherever he goes, he serves the creative principle—when he sows and reaps; when he is true to himself; when he considers a handshake as an inviolable oath. The Vendidat epitomizes all this in the sublime words: "Whoever soweth grain, soweth saintliness."

But struggling man is surrounded by evil and temptation. To be able to oppose these forces successfully, Zoroaster invokes the Aryan blood which calls upon every Persian to serve the god of light. After death, good and evil are separated forever. In a final struggle, Ahura Mazda defeats Ahriman and constructs his kingdom of peace. For a time, the Persians derived great strength from this splendid religious epic. But in spite of such an heroic attempt, the dilution of Aryan blood in Asia could not be stemmed and the great kingdom of the Persians declined. Yet the spirit of Zoroaster and his *Mythos* continued to influence the greater world. The Jews adopted Ahriman as Satan, and evolved their own entirely artifical system of racial admixture out of a Persian system devised to preserve racial purity. This was combined with an obligation-ridden religious law which was, of course, wholly Jewish. The Christian Church appropriated the Persian Idea of a savior as a prince of peace—the *Shaoshiahsh* although adulterated with the Jewish idea of a Messiah. Today, in the heart of Northern Europe, there has awakened to heightened consciousness the same race-soul idea which was taught by Zoroaster. Nordic self-awareness and Nordic racial discipline are the answer today to the Levantine East, which has diffused itself throughout Europe in the form of Jewry and varieties of raceless ecumenicalism.

Persian culture was a grafting upon a Semitic-Oriental trunk. As the commerce and money-power of the lower races began to gain for them material influence, power, and honors, the graft began to decompose. The kin-marriage imperative was forgotten and the "equalizing" of all races necessarily led to bastardization.

Cut into the rock walls of Begistun on the order of a great Persian emperor are the words: *I, Darius, the Great King, King of Kings, of Aryan race. . .*" Today, the Iranian mule-driver passes, uncomprehendingly, by this wall; a sign to the multitude that personality is born and dies with the race.

Most beautifully of all was the dream of Nordic man made manifest in Hellas. Wave upon wave came from the Danube valley and overlaid the earlier population of mixed Aryan and non-Aryan immigrants, bringing fresh creative powers. The ancient Mycenaen culture of the Achaeans was predominantly Nordic in character. Next, Dorian tribes stomed anew the citadels of the racially alien aborigines, subjugating them and overthrowing the dominion of the legendary Phoenician-Semitic King Minos. Until then, he had been master of all the area which was to be known in later times as Hellas.

As sturdy masters and warriors, the Hellenic tribes supplanted the decaying civilization of the Levantine traders, and with the labor of the subjugated races, constructed an incomparable creative culture. Great sagas were carved in stone and leisure time devoted to the composition and singing of immortal tales of the heroes. A true, aristocratic constitution proscribed any miscegenation. The Nordic strength, though reduced by chronic warfare, was continually refreshed by further immigration. Dorians, and then Macedonians, protected the creative blond blood up to the time when these tribes, too, were exhausted and the vastly more numerous forces of the Near East infiltrated through a thousand channels, poisoned Hellas and, in place of the ancient Greeks, produced the effete Levantines who share only the name with their predecessors. The Hellenes have vanished forever; only dead images in stone, only a few isolated remnants remain to proclaim the glorious race-soul which once created Pallas Athena and Apollo.

The Nordic's absolute rejection of magical forms is never more clearly shown than in the religious values of Greece, which are still too little heeded. When scholars *do* happen to touch on the religious aspects of the Hellenes, they only interest themselves in the periods of introverted contemplation when the Greek was already divided within himself and vacillated between his own natural values and those of alien and exotic origin.

But it was the earlier age of Homer, confident in its destiny, which was a period of true religion. For this, our nineteenth century—another age of decline—had no real empathy. The Homeric golden age was not tormented yet with "ethical problems." The figures of Apollo, Pallas Athena, Sky-Father Zeus, were reifications of the truest religious feeling. The golden-haired (chrysokomos) Apollo was the guardian and preserver of everything noble and inspired—order, harmony, artistic balance. Apollo was the dawn of day, at once the protector of inner vision and of

the gift of sight. He was the god of song and of rhythmic movement; not, however, of frenzied dance. The swan, originating in the north, was sacred to him, a symbol of his own bright majesty. And in the manner of the South, the palm was also dedicated to him. On the Delphic temples are engraved the words: "Nothing in excess," and "Know Thyself"—two Homeric-Apollonian credos.

Next to Apollo stood Pallas Athena, symbol of lightning, sprung from the head of Zeus, the blue-eyed daughter of the Thunderer. She was the goddess of wisdom and prudent guardian of the destiny of the Hellenes.

These creations of the Greek soul exemplify the upright and still pure life of the Nordic. In the highest sense, they are religious postulates which proclaim confidence in the Nordic character and in the deities who, ingenuously, reveal themselves as well-disposed towards men. "Homer offers neither polemic nor dogma," says Erwin Rohde, and in this single sentence Rohde has defined the very essence of true religion. This profound student of the Hellenic nature adds, "Homer has little interest in omens and ecstascies, lacking any taste for such." It is the moderation of a superior race which resounds from every page of the *Iliad* and echoes in all the temples of Hellas. But beneath this creative level, there lurked and proliferated Pelesgian, Phoenician, Alpine and, later Levantine values. Continually, in proportion to the strengths of these races, their gods intruded. If the gods of the Greeks were heroes of light and heaven, the gods of the Levant were of the earth. Demeter, Hermes and others are essential creations of the alien race-soul. Pallas Athena is a warrior-protectress of the life struggle: the Pelasgian Ares is a blood-dripping monster, Apollo is the god of the lyre and song: Dionysus (at least in his non-Aryan aspect) is the god of ecstacy and frenzied lust.

For the past two hundred years we have struggled over an interpretation of the Greek world. From Winckelmann by way of German Classicism up to Preller and Voss came the adoration of light, of what is open to the world, of what can be clearly seen. Gradually, however, this line of inquiry loses impetus—its "curve" becomes flatter and flatter. Thinkers and artists became isolated objects of study, divorced from blood and soil. Attempts were made to explain and to critique Greek tragedy as products of an individual's psychology. Homer was understood only in a formal aesthetic manner. Late Hellenic rationalism was called upon to grace bloodless academic journalism. The other school—the Romantic movement—busied itself with the spiritual undercurrents which appear at the end of the *Iliad*, in the festivals for the dead, in the actions of the Erinyes (as described by Aeschylus). Romanticism delved into the souls of the

chthonic counter-gods opposed to the Olympian Zeus. Proceeding from death and its riddles, it came to revere the female principle—especially Demeter—and it ended with the god of the dead, with Dionysus. Welcker, Rohde, and Nietzsche all allude to "Mother Earth" as the formless procreator into whose womb all expiring life returns. With shuddering awe, the great German Romantic movement sensed darker and darker veils interposed before the gods of celestial light, and it immersed itself deeper and deeper into the impulsive, formless, demonic, sexual, ecstatic and chthonic and into mother-worship. Yet it continued to describe all this as "Grecian."

Now two lines of investigation go their separate ways. Albeit the Greek tribes took on a physically and spiritually alien nature, what interests the real researcher is not so much this alloying, which is often only artificial, but the content and form of the *dominant* element. When Jacob Burckhardt says: "What they (the Greeks) did and suffered, they did and suffered freely and differently from all earlier peoples; they appear as original, spontaneous and wide-awake, where with all others mindless necessity more or less prevailed," he illumes with the light of the mind the profoundest qualities of the Greek world. Yet, though he refers later to the Hellenes as Aryans and instances other peoples and races, it never again occurs to him that he had uncovered a law of the racial soul.

Burckhardt describes the Greeks of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. as "complete." The dramatic struggle of races, souls, and gods is thereafter lost in an individualistic aggregation of types. In the end, for all the accumulated knowledge, allusions, and intuitions, the Greek personality is extinguished. The inner freedom of the ancient Hellenes had waged a struggle against the oppressive brutishness of the Near East. It was this great drama of an entire people which not only inspired their greatest achievements, but also made the Hellenes less fortunate than is commonly believed. If this contradiction in the history of Hellas was interpreted later in other ways, that is because the essential basis was ignored.

According to Bäumler, it was Görres who first attributed a universal polarity in history to the tension between the masculine and feminine principles. Bachofen it was, however, who developed and fully formulated this idea, which, in this present era of disintegration of all forms and figures, is celebrating its rebirth.

It was the maternal elements, Night, Earth, Death, which romantic intuition perceived as the undercurrents of "ancient Greek" life. From Etruria by way of Crete and the depths of Asia Minor, matriarchy became

dominant in both custom and law—even in the case of the masculine *tyrannis*. As a result there arose the Amazon concept and the *hetaerea*, as well as poetic hymns to the dead and the mysteries linked with the earth spirit. Mother figures appear, each representing an aspect of the one great mysterious Earth Mother. They are holy and untouchable. If even one mother is slain, the earth itself arises in the shape of the blood-demanding Drinyes who give no rest until the slayer's blood has been spilled and sucked up by the earth as expiation. There is no question of whether right or wrong rests with the mother. A value in itself is represented by each one of them and affords them absolute inviolability. From the mother, the daughter inherits property which secures her independence, her name and her rights. Woman appears as the embodiment of the immortality of matter, or, more correctly, as the image of the indestructibility of matter as an abstraction.

So thought the Lycians and the Cretans (who alone used the term "Motherland"): so thought the Greek islands; so, indeed, thought Athens itself until the Nordic Theseus defeated the Amazons before its gates and a mother was no longer the tutelary deity but the motherless and childless virgin, Pallas Athena.

From the aspect of the world history, the first great and decisive struggle between racial values was decided on Greek soil in favor of the Nordic. Thereafter man approached life from the day, from the laws of light and heaven. From the spirit and will of the father came everything which we claim for ourselves in the great legacy of Greek culture.

Thus it is neither true that matriarchy with all its consequences "was devoid of any relationship to the people," nor that the new system of light was only a "later stage of development," in which the dominance of woman persists as "what was originally given" (Bachofen). This one great misunderstanding, despite many accurate insights, beclouds all other observation and gives rise to a misunderstanding of the whole spiritual development of Greek and Roman antiquity as well as the deepest spiritual struggles of later Western-Germanic culture.

Late Roman, Christian, Egyptian, or Jewish ideas and values have penetrated into the soul of Germanic man and partly destroyed it. We shall have to separate the Germanic values from all others if we are not to be false to ourselves and if we regard history in general as a manifestation and product of the struggle to give form to the most personal self. It is deplorable that first Christian, and later humanist, values have pushed this view of history more and more into the background and substituted the dogma of a supposed "general development of mankind."

In various guises, an abstraction began to uproot life. The reaction in the form of German Romanticism was therefore as welcome as rain after a long drought. But in our own era of universal internationalism, it becomes necessary to follow this racially-linked Romanticism to its core and to free it from certain nervous convulsions which still adhere to it. The Germanic peoples have not "developed" on the basis of some nebulous goal proffered by priests or scholars, but have either asserted themselves or have disintegrated and been subjugated. Similarly, the pre-Greek peoples of the Aegean did not "develop" from the basis of belief in chthonic gods to the sun-heaven cult of Zeus-Apollo. They were submerged after lengthy struggles and, in part politically subjugated, in part spiritually assimilated. Nevertheless, they always waited for moments of weakness among the Nordic Greeks in order to assert once more their old values and their old gods.

Neither climate nor geography nor any other environmental influences are valid as ultimate explanations; for the sun that shone on Homer shone likewise on the worshippers of Isis and Aphrodite. And it continued to shine over the same earth when Greece had passed away.

Before they arrived in Greece, the Hellenes did not view female dominance as "the first stage of development." From the cradle, they obeyed the law of the father. Had it not been so, the Greek gods would have entered into an easy alliance with the Pelasgian-Cretan or proto-Libyan-Egyptian gods in the same manner that the later Greeks rediscovered their own Helios or Hercules in the gods of Aryan India. On the contrary, the Greek myths tell of constant struggle and victory. The Hellenes destroy the bloody Amazon rule in Lemnos with Jason's raid; they send Bellerophon to wipe out this same rule in Lycia; in the Danaid version of St. Bartholomew's Eve, they establish the triumph of Zeus and of the great savior-mediator, Hercules, over the dark tellurian powers of the earth and underworld.

In contrast, therefore, to Nordic-Germanic mythology, Nordic-Greek is so richly formed and so manifold (yet nevertheless in all its main lines the victory of light over darkness remaining) because the Teutonic-Germanic gods had far less resistance to overcome with regard to the religious systems of other races. That is why the *Iliad* is one great paean to the triumph of life and light. Homer understood that death and life are not opposites but that they mutually condition each other. Goethe, too, was to recognize this. It is birth *and* death which confront each other, *but both constitute life.* Recognizing the necessity of this inner law is also to recognize an impersonal destiny—the *Moria.* Thetis foresees the death of

her son but she does not pray to Zeus to let him live. She knows that the sky, personified in him, is also subject to cosmic law, symbolized in the scales of eternity.

The Moirae, like the Norns in Teutonic mythology, are female because in woman the impersonal alone rules. She is the passive vessel of the law.

Here again a Nordic value is revealed; Apollo, whom Aeschylus calls "destroyer of primeval demons," is the vanquisher of the un-Nordic cults. The Lycian Glaucus, when Diomedes asks him about his family, says sadly that the generations of man are like the leaves of a tree. Here is seen the formless and depersonalized pre-Greek ideas which persist despite the introduction of Apollonian sun-worship into Lycia.

In Greek tragedy, which was born at a time when Greece fought its heaviest battles and shattered its human reserves, the Hellenes were compelled to struggle anew against the ancient chthonic forces. This can no longer be expressed in the confident, triumphant words of Homer:

> No, whoever once has died, should be sorrowfully mourned
> One day, and then buried with a resolute heart.

Now it takes the form of the most bitter struggle between two world-views as expression of two utterly different race-souls.

Eriphyle betrays her husband for a necklace; the latter is avenged by his son, who kills his mother. The law of the pre-Greek does not weigh the guilt of the mother. The very earth rises to avenge her shed blood and the Erinyes drive Alcmaeon to madness. Only the advice of Apollo to place his foot on a piece of earth which was still invisible at the time of his mother's slaying, finally saves Alcmaeon. He discovers a newly risen island.

The conflict of race-souls appears most magnificently in Orestes. Here, in the clearest consciousness, the old and new forces are contraposed and this work becomes a parable for all time. The law of the Near East concerning motherhood is not concerned with guilt of Clytemnestra, but dispatches its female agents to exact revenge upon the matricide.

The guardians of the Nordic ethos stand before Orestes to protect him as the avenger of his murdered *father*. "She was not related by blood to the man whom she slew," cry the Erinyes. Apollo answers: "It is the father, not the mother, who is the procreator of her children." Then Athena, daughter of Zeus, declares: "With all my heart I honor everything masculine." However, Athena and Apollo magnanimously offer their hand to the defeated powers in a gesture of reconciliation. To

appease them, they promise those dwellers "deep in sunless night" the respect of men:

> 'But I, ever girded for bold struggle in battle for fame
> Will not rest until all the world
> Holds in highest honor my victorious city.'

Thus Aeschylus concludes just as powerfully and conscious of strength as Homer.

However, Apollo's magnamity had the result that the chthonic gods continued their subterranean life. After the later miscegenation between the Greeks and the aborigines, neither the chthonic nor the celestial deities appear again in pure form. They mingle in the Dionysian rites. Although Dionysus represents the father-right, he also becomes the god of the dead upon whom Antigone calls. He loses the clear, strong character of Apollo and becomes effeminate and drunken. Ultimately, he sinks down into all that is demonic, Maenad-like and nocturnal. Even the animals consecrated to this demonic god are dark. Only at night is homage paid. Everything Dionysian in Greek life appears as something racially and spiritually alien—and ancient. It is to become the surest sign of the psychic deterioration which paralleled the attenuation of the Nordic blood.

By the flickering light of torches, to the clang of cymbals, accompanied by thumping on drums and the shrilling of flutes, the Dionysian celebrants performed their swirling, circling dances. It was mostly the women who whirled about to the point of exhaustion. They wore *bassars*, long flowing garments stitched together from the pelts of foxes. Their hair streamed wildly. Snakes, sacred to Sabazius, were held in their hands. They brandished daggers. In this fashion did they rave until they attained the uttermost climax of excitement. Then, in their "holy madness," they fell upon the animals chosen for sacrifice, clawing and rending the bloody flesh with their teeth and swallowing it raw.

All such rites were diametrically opposed to the ethos of the Greeks. They represented that "religion of frenzy" (Frobenius) which dominated the entire eastern region of the Mediterranean world and was evolved from the African-Near Eastern races and race-mixtures. There is a direct line from the insanely possessed King Saul, through the earthbound intoxication of Dionysus, to the whirling dervishes of Islam. The phallus became the symbol of the later "Grecian" world-idea. Thus, what we find relative to art and to life in this symbol is not Greek but the antithesis, that is, Near Eastern.

The deities of the Near East were everywhere sapping the foundations of the magnificient Hellenic edifice. Thus, for example, the primeval earth-god Poseidon, repelled by Athena: He dwells in the ground under her temple in the form of a serpent; he is the fortress snake of the Acropolis who is fed each month with honey-cake" (Pauly-Wissowa). The Pelasgian python-dragon is also buried at Delphi under the temple of Apollo. Every eight years the slaying of this dragon was enacted before Apollo. This is the same place as the burial of Dionysus.

But the Nordic Theseus did not manage to slay all the monsters of the Near East. At the first signs of the weakening of Aryan blood, they arose again and again as monsters combining the bestial with the physical robustness of Oriental men.

So vital is this knowledge to the proper understanding of both mythology and world history that it is also desirable here to follow the great clash of race-souls where the victory of the Nordic-Apollonian light principle (Pinder speaks of "Danae with blond locks") was only temporary and the old forces reasserted themselves in many hybrid forms.

This spiritual bastardization was naturally furthest advanced in Asia Minor, in Colchis, and in some of the islands. There, the ruling Greek stratum was very thin and could not defend itself forever against chthonic multitudes.

These great and lengthy struggles were naturally condensed in saga and myth, as in the story of the Argonauts and the Apollonian Jason. They sailed, as the saga tells, before a northern wind—a memory of the Nordic origin of Apollo. From the North is the hero of light awaited.

Everywhere the followers of Jason go—like Greek Vikings—they find confronting them dark, chthonic gods, Amazon rule, and the most sensual conception of life. The existence of the Amazons can be easily explained. Roving bands of warriors often left their homes for long periods of time. The women who remained behind had to adjust their lives and to learn to defend themselves against attack. If their menfolk finally returned, they often brought with them strange women, which repeatedly resulted in ourbreaks of murder of the males. Such a deed, reported of the women of Lemnos, reverberated throughout the whole of Greece as a most horrible crime and was retold again and again with renewed horror.

Women, maddened by sexual frustration, fell into unbridled hetaerism, a way of life which always appeared when the Apollonian principle weakened. Yet initially the victory of the latter was always welcomed, since it laid the first real foundations of a stable civilization. Later, nevertheless, the old impulses rebelled against it.

It was thus that Jason was received by the Lemnian Hypsipyle; it was thus that he wedded Medea and contraposed the institution of marriage against the systems of hataerae and the Amazons. Through marriage, the woman, the mother, gained a new and honorable status in accordance with the Nordic-Apollonian principle, and the nobler, fruitful aspect of the Demeter cult gained ascendancy in a manner comparable to the transmogrification of Isis into the Mother of God of the Teuton. But this all disappears wherever Apollo, that is, the Greek, failed to maintain his dominion. This side of the story is illustrated by that same Jason who becomes unfaithful to his marriage while in Corinth, a city deeply under Phoenician influence. It is also to be seen in the story of Hercules, that enemy of matriarchy, who defeats all the Amazons and sweeps across the whole of North Africa as far as the Atlantic, only to fall before Omphale in Lydia.

Thus Apollo could not maintain himself in the East, and the compromise is represented by Dionysian "religion." The fair-haired Jason wears a panther's skin across his shoulders, which symbolizes the subordination of the Apollonian by the Dionysian. the emphasis on Apollo's radiant virility is melded with hetaera-like ecstasy. Dionysus' law of unbridled sexual indulgence signifies the unhindered race-mixing between Hellenes and all types and varieties of the Near East. The formerly man-hating Amazons reappear as crazed Maenads. The Apollonian marriage principle is again broken since the character of Sabazius is wholly oriented toward the female. The male sex begins to lose its identity. Men participate in the Dionysian revels but only dressed as women.

From this racial pollution of the Near East, the bastardy of Dionysus extended itself westward until it dominated the entire Mediterranean. In Rome, the Dionysians especially proliferated among the criminal classes. In the second century, the Senate, after long tolerating this quasi-religious cult, felt compelled to repress with great rigor the Bacchic gatherings. About 7,000 perjurers, swindlers, and conspirators were banished or executed. Only in Hellas itself did the radiant Apollonian principle, mastering chaos, still prevail.

Thus Dionysus, while he appears in Greek paintings as Hellenic, is effeminate and is surrounded by Near Eastern satyrs, who also appear on grave monuments as screeching grotesqueries of a decadent world. Bachofen sums it up by saying that Apollo invaded Asia but returned as Dionysus. However, what he and others overlook is that Zeus-Apollo represented the spiritual imperative of Nordic-Greek blood, whereas the

Hetaera life-style is an expression of Near Eastern and African races. The mixing of myths and values was simultaneously a process of racial bastardization, and many of the legends of the Greeks are the poetic allegories of the struggle between different racially-determined souls.

This Near Eastern-African underworld is revealed most vividly in the historically attested figure of Pythagoras. He is said to have traveled throughout Babylonia and to India. He himself is described as a Pelasgian, and he did in fact practice his "mysteries" in Asia Minor, joined by ecstatic "mystical women." He was unable to gain credence in Greece proper. Aristotle and Heraclitus referred to him derogatorily and were plainly resentful of his mathematical cabalism. Aristotle said that Pythagoras' fame was based on his appropriation of alien spiritual values. This was also the opinion of Heraclitus who said that Pythagoras had woven together "a false art and charlatanry" from various writings. "A pretense at universal knowledge," said the Hellenic sage, "does not instruct the spirit."

So Pythagoras moved to the West, to southern Italy, where, like some ancient blend of Rudolf Steiner and Annie Besant, he set up his school of mysteries complete with priestesses. He was regarded throughout the entire African littoral—whence came the collectivist sexual mysteries of the Egyptian Carpocrates to his aid—as the wisest of the wise. Universal equality is once again promoted in the form of democratic ecumenicalism. Women and property are held in common, although this had been the basis of non-Nordic Mediterranean ideas when Apollo first battled against them.

It cannot be emphasized too often that such assertions as, "the end of human development will again bring back the earliest animal state," represent a grotesque error. This is all the more certain when, like a lightning flash, we see that the Pythagorean cult can be traced back to pre-Hellenic peoples. Further confusion follows, however, by statements to the effect that the Hellenes had wrested themselves free from the chthonic substance—as though they had been embedded in the latter!

The dramatic creation of Greece took place on two levels. On one level there is an organic evolution of substance—from nature-symbolism, crowned with the gods of light and the heavens, to Zeus, father of the gods: and on the other, from the mystical-artistic level to the dramatic-artistic recognition of the spiritual essences and finally, to the intellectual system of Plato, which was a philosophical perception of what had already been developed in myth.

This entire development, however, stands in continuous conflict with other mythical and intellectual systems, the products of alien blood. In part ennobled by fusion with the Greeks, nevertheless such systems eventually welled up on all sides. As products of the Nilotic swamps, the waters of Asia Minor, and the deserts of Libya, they were hostile to the Nordic ethos of the Greeks and sought to pervert, falsify, and destroy its vital character.

This must not be mistaken for an explosion of natural tensions within an organic whole. It was rather a struggle between hostile race-souls to which we bear awed witness even today when we observe the ruin of Hellas with clear eyes. Our own blood dictates where our own loyalties lie, and only bloodless pedagogues can prate here about the "parity of two great principles."

With infinite sadness we watch the epiphenomena of the psychic-racial decline of the Homeric Greeks who once, in the proud words of the poet, entered the arena of world history, "Always to be first, and always to press forward." We watch the Greek become a participant in racial-spiritual decay, wearing himself out in the struggle against what is alien, as well as against his own disintegrating essence. The great Theognis complains that money mixes the blood of the noble with that of the ignoble and that in this way race, which is strictly protected among asses and horses, becomes polluted among men. In the *Gorgias*, Plato vainly makes Callicles proclaim the wisest of messages: "The law of nature demands that the higher breeds rule over the lower." To be sure, "our [*Athenian*] laws" were different. In accordance with them the strongest and most virtuous would be caught like young lions, to be corrupted by "magical songs and trickery." If a true hero should again appear, he would trample down all these magical rites and advance radiantly forward by a natural right.

But this yearning for a hero was in vain; money, and with it the *Untermenschen*, had already triumphed over blood. Lacking sure instinct, the Hellene began to devote himself to trade, politics and sophistries, rejecting one day what he had praised the day before. Sons no longer respected their fathers; slaves from all over the world agitated for "freedom"; sexual equality was proclaimed. Symbolic of this democracy—as Plato scornfully remarked—asses and horses began to push aside men who stood in their way. As warfare depleted the race, newcomers were admitted to citizenship. Foreign barbarians became "Athenians," much as in our era Eastern Jews become "Germans." Thus

Isocrates, lamenting, remarked that after the Egyptian expedition of 458 B.C., those noble families which had survived the Persian War were annihilated. "But call not that city *happy* which gathers its citizens willy-nilly from all ends of the earth, but only that one which best preserves the race of its founders." Similarly the sad utterance of Jacob Burckhardt: "From the inception of democracy, they were seized by an impulse to persecute without limit all superior individuals. It was the usual hatred of talent." However this democracy was not the rule of the people but the dominion of the Near East over the Greek tribes, whose manpower and strength were being rapidly dissipated. It was the rule of the now-uninhibited scum over the hoplites who were no longer sustained by a racially-kindred peasantry and had become effete. Demagogues without conscience incited the masses against Athens in order to be able to denounce them later. However, when the Athenians came there was a mass flight from the threatened cities and supine surrender to the advancing imperial power. The cry was: "If we had not declined so quickly, we should have perished." In a frenzied effort to rebuild the land, the chaotic democracy instituted amnesties, cancellation of obligations and land redistribution. In doing so, it only became more effete than ever.

The city-states exhausted themselves in bloody economic wars or became desolate and empty as the Hellenes migrated to all parts of the known world. There they either fertilized barbarian soil with Greek culture or suffered further decline and ultimate annihilation. Where flourishing cities had once stood and gleaming temples, where the free Greeks had once competed in the arenas, later travelers found only desolation, a depopulated land, fallen pillars. Empty pedestals gave mute testimony to the gods and heroes whose statues had once stood upon them. By Plutarch's time, scarcely 3,000 hoplites could still be mustered. Dio Chrysostom reported that the ancient Greek type had become a very rare phenomenon. "Does not the Peneus stream through an empty Thessaly and the Ladon flow through a devastated Arcadia? Are there any cities more abandoned than Croton, Metapontum, and Tarentum?" Thus did Hysiae, Tiryns, Asine and Orneae lie in ruins. The temple of Zeus at Nemea had fallen; even the port of Nauplia was abandoned. Of Lacedaemon's "hundred cities," there remained only thirty villages. Pausanias described the ruins of Dorion and Andania in Mycenae. Of Pylos only ruins remained, of Letrinoi only a few dwellings. Megalopolis, the "great city," was now only a great desolation. Only a few wretched traces could be found of Mantinea, Orchomenus, Heraea, Maenalus, Cynaetha, etc. Of Lycosura only the city walls still stood; of Oresthasion only temple pillars. The

acropolis of Asea was destroyed except for some fragments of wall. Daphnus, Augeia, Calliaros, once praised by Homer, were torn down. Orleanus was dust. The jewels of Hellas, Calydon and Pleuron, were obliterated. Delos was so devastated that when Athens dispatched a guard to the temple there, they constituted the sole inhabitants.

And yet even in his deepening twilight, the Greek had stemmed the incursion of Asia and scattered his own brilliant gifts all over the world, gifts which inspired the Nordic Romans and later became the greatest heritage of the Germanic West. In spite of the sacrifice of the Greeks, therefore, Apollo may be credited with the first great victory of Nordic Europeans, for after him there emerged from the hyperborean fastnesses new bearers of the same values of freedom of soul and spirit, of organic shaping and questing creativity. For a long time the Roman sword repelled the reinforced Near Eastern specter. More rigorously and consciously, Rome nurtured the patriarchal principle. It thereby strengthened the idea of the State as such and of marriage as the prerequisite of national and racial preservation. Finally, in time Germania (in a new form) became the representative of the god of the heavens.

The history of Rome essentially parallels that of Hellas, although it is set against a greater expanse of territory and a larger political power structure. Rome, too, was established by a Nordic folk-wave which poured into the fertile valleys to the south of the Alps long before the Gauls and the Teutons. It broke the dominion of the Etruscans, that mysterious and alien Near Eastern people. Presumably this wave blended with the still pure indigenous tribes of the Mediterranean race, producing a hybrid character of the greatest toughness and tenacity which combined nimbleness of intellect with the iron energy of masters, farmers and heroes. Ancient Rome, about which history tells us little, became a true *Volk* state through sound breeding, and was united in the struggle against the whole of Orientalism. All the brains and strengths which would be squandered later when Rome engaged in world conflicts, were formed and *banked*, as it were, in this "pre-historic" period. The three hundred ruling noble families supplied the 300 Senators and from them came also the provincial governors and the senior army officers. Encircled by the maritime races of the Near East, Rome was often compelled to defend itself ruthlessly with the *gladius*.

The destruction of Carthage was a deed of superlative import in racial history: by it even the later cultures of Central and Western Europe were spared the infection of this Phoenician pestilence. World history might

well have taken a very different course had the obliteration of Carthage been accompanied by a total annihilation of all the other Semitic-Jewish centers in the Near East. The act of Titus came too late. By then, the Near Eastern parasite was no longer centered in Jerusalem but had already spread its strongest tentacles from Egypt and Hellas to Rome itself, to which city everyone possessed of ambition and greedy for profit was drawn. There they made every effort to buy the acquiescence of the sovereign, self-governing people with bribes and promises. As a result of alien racial immigration, there arose from a previously legitimate popular electorate—peers with common roots—a degraded mass of characterless human rabble, a permanent threat to the State. Cato stood as a lonely rock in the midst of this quagmire. As praetor of Sardinia, consul in Spain, and finally censor in Rome, he fought against corruption, usury and extravagance. In this he resembled Cato the elder who, after a fruitless struggle to stem the utter decay of the State, threw himself upon his own sword. Such a deed has been called Old Roman. Indeed it was. But "Old Roman" is synonymous with *Nordic*. In later times, when the Germans offered their services to weak, degenerate emperors who were surrounded by impure bastards, the same spirit of honor and loyalty lived within them as had once lived in the ancient Romans. The Emperor Vitellius, a poltroon without equal, was dragged from his hiding place to the Forum, a rope around his neck. His German bodyguard refused to surrender and spurned the offer of absolution from their oaths. They were slain to the last man. The same Nordic spirit possessed the German which had dwelled in Cato. It is the spirit we saw in Flanders in 1914, in the Coronel Islands, and for years in all quarters of the globe.

By the middle of the fifth century B.C., the first step towards chaos had been taken. Mixed marriages between patricians and plebians were made legal. Race-mixing thus became for Rome, as it had for Persia and Hellas, the seed of ultimate decay of *Volk* and State. In 336, the first plebians had pushed their way into the Roman Assembly, and by about 300 into the priesthood. In 287, the plebian popular assembly had become a state institution. Traders and money-lenders pushed their interests. Ambitious, renegade patricians like the Gracchi espoused democratic causes—motivated perhaps by mistaken generosity. Others, like Publius Claudius, placed themselves openly at the head of the Roman city mob.

In these chaotic times, a few men still held true: The powerful, blue-eyed Sulla, the pure Nordic Augustus. But they could not turn the tide. And so it was that control of the masses of the vast Roman Empire came to depend, like a monstrous game of chance, upon control of the Prae-

torian Guard or the adherence of a mob of hungry clients. Sometimes a great man would arise; sometimes a bloodthirsty monster. Rome's initial treasure-house of racial strength was exhausted by four hundred years of race-destroying democracy. The Caesars came now from the provinces. Trajan was the first Spainard to wear the purple; Hadrian was the second. Caesars were now adopted as a last-ditch attempt to save the situation. Since reliance could no longer be placed on blood-lines, it was felt that only personal selection could ensure the continuity of the State.

The values held by Marcus Aurelius, another Spaniard, were already enervated by Christian influences. He openly elevated the protection of slaves, the emancipation of women, and doles to the poor (what we call unemployment benefit) to official State policies. He also disenfranchised the *paterfamilias* which had been the strongest tradition in republican Rome and which was the last remaining source of type-formation.

There followed Septimius Severus, an African. "Pay the soldiers well and scorn everyone else," he advised his sons, Caracalla and Geta. Influenced by his Syrian mother (daughter of a priest of Baal in Asia Minor), Caracalla, the most loathsome bastard ever to sit on the throne of the Caesars, declared that all "free" inhabitants of the Roman Empire were citizens of Rome (212 A.D.).

So perished the Roman world. Macrinus next murdered Caracalla and became Caesar himself. After he was murdered in turn, he was succeeded by the monster Elagabalus, nephew of the African Severus. In the midst of all this appeared the half-German Maximinus "Thrax" and Philippus the Arab (a Semite). The Senate seats became mostly lounging spots for non-Romans. The culture of this period was supplied by the Spaniard Martial and the Greeks Plutarch, Strabo, Dio Cassius, etc. Apollodorus, who rebuilt the Forum, was another Greek. Included in this last category was Aurelian, an Illyrian born in Belgrade. There was also Diocletian, son of an Illyrian slave (perhaps of partly German ancestry). Constantius Chlorus was of Illyrian origin, though of superior stock. After his death, the soldiers chose a truly powerful man to bear the title of *Augustus*. This was Constantine, the son of Constantius Chlorus and a barmaid from Bithynia. Constantine triumphed over all his rivals. With Constantine the history of Imperial Rome ends and that of Papal and Germanic Rome begins.

In this sea of bewildering diversity, Roman, Syrian, African and Greek elements were intermingled. The gods and the ceremonies of all lands found a place in the venerable Forum. There the priest of Mithras sacrificed bulls, latter-day Greeks prayed to Helios, astrologers and Or-

iental sorcerers touted their miracles. The Emperor Elagabalus harnessed six white horses to a gigantic meteorite and had this dragged through the streets of Rome as a manifestation of Baal of Emesa. He himself danced at the head of the procession. Behind him were dragged the old gods and the "people" of Rome applauded. The senators abased themselves. Street singers, barbarians, and stable lads became senators and consuls—until Elagabalus, too, was strangled and thrown into the Tiber, that final resting place of so many thousands for two millennia.

Even if we had lacked the more recent racial-historical investigation, we should have been compelled to endorse this interpretation of the Roman past, because in the course of studying Ancient Roman customs, myths, and definitions of law and the State in all areas, we see that the very ancient values which were associated with Africa and the Near East, suddenly or gradually transformed into their opposites (even when retaining their old nomenclature).

Thus our "learned" historians have ascertained—and they are still doing so—that in north and central Italy lived the Etruscans, Sabines, Oscians, Sabellians, Aequi, and Samnites, whereas in the south were the Phoenicians, Sicilians, Greek traders and settlers, and various Near Eastern peoples. Suddenly—how and why is not explained—a conflict broke out against one section of these tribes, their gods and goddesses, their concepts of law, their political pretensions. No mention is made of the new factor in this upheaval, or if it is mentioned, it is without any enquiry into its real nature. The academic world falls back on the threadbare "development of humanity" cliche, which apparently rose up in the service of "ennoblement." At this point the fact-collectors are at one with the Romantic school of mythologists; both agreeing that the Etruscans certainly possessed a "higher culture" than the bucolic Latins.

Since this version of a sudden, almost magical, leap toward a higher spiritual level and superior forms of social organization eventually became discredited, even newer interpreters of history invented the theory known as cyclic culture. This new doctrine was just a vacuous as the theory of universal development, which has validity only in the mind of the academic or the priest. There was as little mention of the *creators* of this cultural revolution as there was of evolution in the writings of nineteenth-century popes. Out of the blue one day, a cultural revolution drops magically upon Indians, Persians, Chinese, or Romans and effects a total transformation of human creatures who had previously embraced different mores. We are told of a kind of vegetable-like growth, the blossoming and decaying of mystical "cycles," until the proselytizers of

"the Morphology of History," faced with the strongest criticism, finally mumble at the end of the second or third volume something about blood and blood relationships.

Even this latest intellectual legerdemain is now beginning to lose credibility. The "Roman culture cycle" and "new development" did not stem from the native Etruscan-Phoenician stock, but *in spite* of it and its values. The new culture-bearers were Nordic immigrants and a noble Nordic aristocracy which began to contest the soil of Italy with the aboriginal Negroid Ligurians and the Near-Eastern Etruscans. It is true that in this environment the Nordic aristocracy had to make a number of concessions. However, it demonstrated its true character in the most bitter of struggles, and more relentlessly than the more artistically gifted Hellenes had done, when it expelled the last Etruscan king, Tarquinius Superbus. Though a great part of these achievements became the common heritage of all Europe, much that was decayed and alien was later transmitted into Europe by the strong resurgent tide of race-chaos.

The Etruscans, Ligurians, Sicilians, and Phoenicians (or Carthaginians) were not "an earlier stage of development," nor were they tribes of the Roman people which had each made its contribution to the general culture. The true shapers of the Roman State stood implacably against them all, and on the basis of racial-*Volkisch* principles subjected and partially exterminated them. Only that spirit, that will, those values which revealed themselves in this struggle deserve to be called *Roman*. The Etruscans present us with an unequalled example of the way in which the Greek religion and way of life afforded them neither progress nor spiritual elevation. Like other Near Eastern peoples, the Etruscans had encountered at one point the Atlanto-Nordic myths, which were by then embodied in Greek tradition, and they imitated Greek plastic and pictorial art as best they could, even appropriating the Hellenic pantheon. They succeeded only in corrupting everything they touched and turning each attribute into its opposite. Yet this provided reason enough for certain "researchers" to prattle foolishly about the "extraordinary spiritual legacy" of the Etruscans and the "basis for growth" it provided, and for the "world-historical dedication" symbolized in their "tragic fate." All this plainly derives from the same inner sense of identity which binds the rising asphalt humanity of the megalopolis in a very significant way to all the wretched refuse of Asia.

The legends and the tombs of the Etruscans make very clear the reasons why the virile, healthy farmer folk engaged in so desperate a war against them. Two examples epitomize the character of the Etruscans; the sacred prostitute and the priest-magician who, by means of dreadful

rites, kept at bay the terrors of the underworld. The "great whore of Babylon" of whom Apocalypse speaks is no fairy tale or metaphor, but an historical reality attested to a hundredfold. It was literally the rule of the hetaerae over the peoples of the Near and Middle East. On high festival days at all the centers of these various racial groups, the official prostitutes were enthroned as the embodiment of a common sensuality and universal lechery. In Phoenicia they served Cybele and Astarte; in Egypt, the great procuress Isis; in Phrygia as priestesses of wholly unbridled communal sexual orgies. The reigning priestess of love was joined by her lover dressed in diaphanous Libyan robes. Anointed with costly perfumes and bedecked with precious jewels, they then copulated before all the people (just as did Absalom with David's concubines in 2 Sam. 16:22). This example was imitated in Babylon, in Libya, and in Rome under the Etruscan dynasty where the goddess-priestess pushed the institution of the heterae to its extreme limit in the closest collaboration with the Etruscan priests.

Attempts were made quite early to "interpret" Etruscan inscriptions on graves, mummy-wrappings and papyrus rolls, but not until Albert Grunwedel was the script successfully deciphered, and the results show the Etruscans in a hideous light. Even the Greek solar myth that the sun dies and is then reborn as a god out of the dark night and with redoubled potency, was appropriated as an Etruscan *motif*. But in the hands of the Etruscan priests this becomes Asiatic magic, witchcraft linked with pederasty, masturbation, the murder of boys, magical appropriation of *mana* of the slaughtered by the priestly murderer, and prophecies derived from the excrement and the piled-up entrails of the victims. The virile sun impregnates itself with the magical phallus on the solar disc (the Egyptian "point" in the sun) which finally penetrates it. From this is born a golden boy, the "foetus of a boy with a magical orifice." This is the so-called "seal of eternity." The violence of the magical phallus is imagined as a bull which copulates with such frenzied force that the disc rolls and the "phallus bearer of the horn" turns to fire, "the phallus of him who possesses the heavens."

In endlessly repeated obscenities, the original myth is degraded into repulsive homosexual love. This is to be seen on the wall paintings of graves, as in the Golini tomb where the dead man holds a banquet with his boy lover in the next world, and where two gigantic phalluses spring up from a sacrificial fire as a result of magical satanic rite. According to the inscription, this "the lightning of perfection, is thus perfected."

Translated from the jargon of magic, that means that the creature born of woman is deified after putrefying, and becomes a phallus.

From the inscription of the Cippus of Perugia, there is recorded a convocation of satanic priests who "perfect" a spectral manifestation "so as to burn in demonic frenzy." "He who has this boy has the demonic knife. Eternal is the fire of the boy. . .a magus of the perfected seal."

The murdered boy now becomes a "little goat." Thunder personified is a metamorphosis of the son gained by violation—the perfected little goat. Here is to be found the origin of the horned apparition and the goat-headed Devil, whose appearance in the literature of witchcraft was hitherto an unsolved riddle. Its antique types are the Minotaur, especially the one over the well-known grave of Corneto, the *Tomba dei Tori*, and the Greek satyr. "He clearly illustrates a crime crying out to heaven," comments Grunwedel. The meaning of these constantly repeated customs of the Etruscan religion is to be seen in the fate of the shamefully abused boy prostitute who is slit open to symbolize the birth of the diurnal sun from the egg that his apparition has developed when fertilized by the semen collected in bowls.

Thus a spectral bull appears, fiery like the sun, sexually erect, and accomplishes again and again the demonic self-copulation. With the performance of this ritual, the *mana* of the murdered boy is supposed to pass to the priest, who is the representative of the "Chosen" (*Rasna, Rasena*) as the Etruscans—like the Jews—called themselves. The priest next lets the fumes from the entrails ascend to heaven. There is also the magical use of feces, once again in a vile travesty of the Greek solar myth. The divine cherub attains the supreme power which emanates from him as six rolls of gold excrement, creating the fire of the heavens.

The "chosen one" becomes such by supplying his entrails. Etruscan vases provide ample evidence of this; witches are portrayed, offering money to youths to persuade them to dedicate themselves and then to ascend to heaven in flames. Herein lies new evidence for the primeval home of witchcraft and Satanism on European soil. It is easy to understand a scholar like Grunwedel, who in this respect sees close analogies with the Tibetan Tantras of Lamaism, saying:

> A nation which is ready to paint wall pictures over the entrances of graves like the two scenes in the Tomba dei Tori, which permits itself to write such filth in graves and paintings like those in the Golini grave, and to cover sarcophagi with the most repulsive scenes (I

> need mention only the sarcophagus of Chinsi), to place into one's hands representations of the dead as in the text of the Pulenana papyrus roll, to cover toilet articles with the most hair-raising obscenities, parades the most despicable human degeneracy as its national legacy and religious persuasion.

It is necessary as a prelude to be quite clear about the true nature of the Etruscans so that we may understand fully that the Nordic Latins, the true Romans, had the same experiences as the Nordic Hellenes before them and the Nordic Teutons after them. As a numerically small people they waged a desperate struggle against the forces of hetaerism, with their strong emphasis on partriarchy and the family. They purified the great whore Tanaquil by transforming her into the faithful protectress of motherhood and portraying her with dresses and a spindle as a guardian of the family. Against the sorceries of an outrageous priesthood they posed the hard Roman law and the dignity of the Roman Senate. With the sword they cleansed Italy of the Etruscans (as a result of which the great Sulla came particularly to the fore) and of the Carthaginians, whom the former always called to their aid. Yet the preponderance of numbers, prevalent superstition, and the usual international solidarity of rogues and charlatans gradually eroded the old honorable Roman life. This was exacerbated by the necessity of maintaining Roman strength by enlisting the support of the racial cesspool of the Mediterranean peoples. In particular, Rome was unable to cast out the Haruspices and the Augurs. Even Sulla was accompanied by the Haruspex Postumius, and Julius Caesar after him by another of that ilk named Spurinna. Burckhardt had already had an inkling of these now established facts—which are carefully ignored by the "Etruscans" of our great cities. He wrote in his *Griechische Kulturgeschichte* as follows:

> When, however, with the unleashing of all human passions during the last years of the Roman Republic, human sacrifice again appeared in a most abominable form, when oaths were made over the entrails of slaughtered boys—as with Catilina and Vatinus (*see* Cicero, *Vatin.* 6)—then it is to be hoped that this had nothing to do with Greek religion or the ostensible Pythagoreanism of Vatinus. The Roman gladiatorial contests, towards which Greece maintained a permanent abhorrence, had derived from *Etruria,* at first as funerary rites for dead aristocrats.

This clearly indicated that human sacrifice was also a feature of the Etruscan religion.

The Etruscan priest Volgatius who, at Caesar's funeral, ecstatically

proclaimed the last century of the Etruscans, was only one of the many who exercised great power over Roman life and manipulated the sufferings of the people in the interests of the Near East. When Hannibal stood before the gates of Rome, these Haruspices declared that victory was only possible by adopting the cult of the "Great Mother." This was brought from Asia Minor and the Senate abased itself by going down to the shore on foot to receive it. In this way, the priesthood of Asia Minor entered the eternal city along with the "great whore" of the Pelasgians or the "beautiful and delighful whore" (Nah. 3:4) and took up residence on the sacred Palatine, the focal point of the old Roman thought and culture. There ensued the usual Near Eastern "religious" processions. Later, however, the debaucheries were restricted to the district to the rear of the temple walls in order to escape the anger of the better part of the people.

The Haruspices triumphed. The Roman papacy was their immediate successor and the temple hierarchy, the College of Cardinals, represented an amalgam of the Etruscan-Near-Eastern-Syrian priesthood with the Jews and the Nordic Roman Senate.

The medieval picture of the world also derives from the Etruscan Haruspices, that frightful superstition of magic and witchcraft to which the millions of Europe fell victim. Nor did this die out with the *Hexenhammer.* It still survives in Church literature today, to be resurrected at any time. It can be seen in those gargoyles which not infrequently disfigure our Nordic-Gothic cathedrals with a grotesquerie of extreme abnormality.

Even in Dante, in a grandiose form, bastardized Etruscan antiquity erupts anew. His Inferno contains the ferryman of hell, the fiery swamp of the Styx, the bloodthirsty Pelasgian Erinyes and Furies, the Cretan Minotaur, those fiends in the form of disgusting birds who torment suicides, and the amphibious monster, Beryon. The damned run through a scorching desert under a rain of fiery drops. Malefactors are turned into bushes upon which the Harpies feed and from every broken twig their blood gushes forth accompanied by unending screams of agony. Black bitches pursue other evil-doers and tear them to pieces with unspeakable pain. Horned demons scourge swindlers. Prostitutes are drowned in stinking excrement. Popes, guilty of simony, are confined within narrow ravines. There they languish, their tortured feet writhing in flames, while Dante rails loudly against the degenerate Papacy as the whore of Babylon.

The grave inscriptions and paintings in Tuscany reveal that all these ideas of the underworld are of Etruscan origin. Just as in the "Christian-

ized" upper world of the Middle Ages, the idea of eternity is depicted with people hung by their hands and tormented with burning faggots and other fiendish devices.

The avenging Furies were depicted by the Etruscans as "utterly loathsome, with animalistic or negroid features, pointed ears, matted hair, fangs, and so forth." It was one such Fury with a bird's beak who tortured Theseus with her poisonous snakes, as a wall painting at the Toma dell' Orco at Corneto shows. Does this reveal the primeval hatred for the legendary conqueror of the ancient demons of Athens? Beside these Furies are Typhon and Echidna, those horrible, one-eyed demons with snakes for hair. The Etruscans generally dwelt with sadistic pleasure over every possible representation of torture, murder and sacrifice. The slaughter of human beings was especially delightful for them.

Musically untalented, lacking any poetic gifts, incapable of producing an organic architecture of their own, and without even the rudiments of philosophy, this Near Eastern people devoted itself to the study of birds' entrails and to complex magical and sacrificial rites. Not without some technical ability, it was almost wholly dedicated to commerce, and because it was tenacious, it poisoned Roman blood and transmitted its obsession with hellish torments in the world to come to the churches. The ghastly and bestial demons became an enduring and effective tool of the Popes and through the conceptual world that had been poisoned by the Church of Rome, dominated our Middle Ages. Medieval art gives shocking testimony to this. One can see the proof of this even on the Isenheim altar, as well as in the "Descents into Hell" by other artists.

Only when we have learned to recognize the utterly alien origins of these concepts and muster the resolution to rid ourselves of this diabolism will we have cast off the "Middle Ages." But with our emancipation, the Roman Church, which is inextricably linked with the sadistic visions of the Etruscan hell, will collapse from within.

The whole mystagogy of Dante's Inferno consists of a hideous marriage of Etruscan demonology and Christianity. Nevertheless, even though Dante was not free from the incubus of this thousand-year-old malefic vision, the Germanic spirit still stirred within him.

In Purgatory, Virgil says of Dante: "He seeks freedom." Such words are a direct denial of the psychic milieu from which witchcraft and the idea of powerful evil spirits arose. In the end, Virgil could safely leave his protege, since Dante had acquired the necessary strength of his own. "My knowledge, my words, can explain nothing more to you/ Free,

upright, healthy, are the signs of your will/ It would be foolish not to follow it."

Such are the two worlds that tore apart the heart of Nordic man in the Middle Ages. On the one hand was the Near-Eastern idea of a hideous hell which the Church adopted; on the other, the longing to be "free, upright and healthy." Only insofar as he is free can the Teuton be creative. Only where the insane terrors of witchcraft did not hold sway could great centers of European culture flourish.

Into this raceless stew which was now Rome came Christianity. Its success is largely to be explained by its concept of a sinful world and redemption through grace, which was its natural compliment. The doctrine of original sin would have been incomprehensible to a people whose racial identity was unadulterated. In such a people there dwells a secure confidence in itself and in its will, which it regards as Destiny. The concept of "sin" was as alien to the heroes of Homer as it was to the ancient Indians, the Germans of Tacitus, or the epics and sagas of Dietrich von Bern. An oppressive sense of sin is a sure symptom of racial bastardy. Race pollution shows itself in a number of stigmata; in an absence of clear direction in thought and action; an inner self-doubt; the feeling that existence is simply the "wages of sin" and not the necessary and mysterious imperative of self-development. The sense of personal depravity leads to a yearning for grace and this is the only hope for the products of miscegenation.

It was natural, therefore, in whomsoever the old Roman character still lived, that a revulsion arose against the spread of Christianity, most especially as it represented a thoroughly proletarian and nihilistic *political* ethos. The grossly exaggerated accounts of bloody persecutions of Christians were not in fact attempts at suppression of conscience, as Church history claims (the Forum was open to all gods), but rather aimed at the protection of the State against a *political* threat to its existence. It was reserved to the Church, in its Pauline-Augustinian form, to invent doctrinal councils and burning at the stake for the purpose of annihilating the spirit. Classical Nordic antiquity did not know the like of this, and the Germanic world has likewise always rebelled against this Levantine import.

Ecclesiastical Christianity has made Diocletian a particular target of its attacks. Diocletian was of lowly origins though probably of part-German ancestry. He had blue eyes and a very white skin and was a man of personal probity of the type admired by Marcus Aurelius. His family life was above reproach. In all matters of State, Diocletian conducted himself

with great moderation. He was opposed to all forms of oppression and favored religious toleration and only authorized action against Egyptian tricksters, fortune-tellers, and sorcerers. The Emperor Gallienus had already given official recognition to the Christian cult and Christian buildings were erected without interference. What disturbed an organic development, however, was initially the squabbles of the rival bishops.

Diocletian excused his Christian soldiers from the pagan sacrifices and insisted only on military discipline. But it was precisely in this area that his authority was challenged by the leaders of the African church, so that recruits refused to perform their duties on the grounds of their Christianity. One such pacifist, despite friendly admonitions, persisted in his obduracy until at length he had to be executed for mutiny. Such threatening symptoms at last persuaded Diocletian to insist on the participation of Christians in state ceremonies of a religious nature. Even now, he did not generally punish Christians who refused to obey, but merely granted them discharges from military service. The only result was a stream of unmitigated abuse from the Christians, the mutual conflicts of whose factions also menaced civil peace in other ways. Finally, the State took action in self-defense. Even now, Diocletian did not exact the death penalty (as he did in the case of some swindling merchants) but only reduced the contumacious to the status of the slave class. The outcome of this was rioting and arson directed against the Emperor's palace itself. Provocations by the Christian communities, hitherto unmolested and which had become arrogant in consequence, followed one after another throughout the empire. The ensuing "terrible persecutions of the Christians" by the "monster Diocletian" amounted to—nine rebellious bishops executed, and in Palestine, the center of the most violent resistance, a total of eighty death sentences actually carried out. By contrast, that supremely Christian Duke of Alba slaughtered 100,000 heretics in the tiny Netherlands alone.

Only by re-examining these events is it possible to shake off the hypnotic effect of systematically falsified history. Thus does Julian the Apostate, who also believed in equal rights for all the cults, appear in a new light, because he did not shirk, on the grounds of pious convictions, standing out against teachers of the "Representative of God." He well knew what was involved when he wrote: "Through the follies of the Galileans, our state was almost ruined; but now, the gods be praised, it is saved. Therefore we shall honor the gods and every city in which there is still piety." This proved thoroughly justified, for no sooner had Christianity become the state religion under Constantine, than the Old Testa-

ment spirit of hatred showed its hideous face. The Christians at once demanded the application of the punishments prescribed in the Old Testament against the worship of idols. In Italy, with the exception of Rome itself, the temples of Jupiter were closed. We can sympathize with the despair of Julian, but at the same time we can see that the history of early Christianity needs rewriting—and that Bishop Eusebius is hardly a reliable source. Christianity, as it was introduced to Europe via the Roman Church, derives from a multitude of roots. This is not the place for a more detailed study of its sources; a few observations only must suffice.

The great personality of Jesus Christ, whatever form it might have taken originally, was distorted and confused immediately after his death with all the rubbish of Jewish and African life. In the Near East, Rome ruled with great firmness and exacted the taxes efficiently. Accordingly, among their subject populations there arose the desire for a liberator and leader of the slaves; hence the legend of Christos. Beginning in Asia Minor, this Christos myth spread to Palestine where it became linked with Jewish messianic yearnings, and was finally attached to the personality of Jesus. Besides his own utterances, there were falsely attributed to him the words and doctrines of Near Eastern prophets and, ironically indeed, in the form of an extension of ancient Aryan moral precepts; for example, the nine Commandment table which had already been appropriated by the Jews as their *ten* prohibitions. In this manner was Galilee joined with the whole Near East.

The Christian movement, disrupting old forms, seemed to the Pharisee Saul to hold great promise of practical usefulness. In a sudden decision he joined its ranks and, possessed by an unrestrained fanaticism, he preached international revolution against the Roman Empire. In spite of all subsequent attempts at reform, his teachings still remain the Jewish spiritual basis, the Talmudic-Oriental aspect of both the Catholic and the Lutheran churches.

Paul accomplished something which is never admitted in churchly circles. He made the suppressed Jewish national rebellion *internationally* effective, thus paving the way for the further spread of racial chaos in the ancient world. The Jews in Rome knew very well what they were about when they placed their synagogues at his disposal as places wherein he could make his proselytizing speeches.

The fact that Paul, despite occasional criticism of the Jews, knew quite well that he served a Jewish cause is to be seen in several all-too-candid passages in his letters:

> . . .Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.
>
> And so all Israel shall be saved. . . .Whose *are* the fathers. . . . Who are the Israelites; to whom *pertaineth* the adoption and the glory and the convenants, and the giving of the law, and the service *of God*, and the promises;
>
> . . .and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came. . . .For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural *branches* be grafted into their own olive tree?

This is identical to the teachings of the modern misbegotten sect of "Serious Bible Students."

The Gospel of St. John which still retains an aristocratic spirit, strove to defend Christianity against this collective bastardization, orientalization and judaization. About the year 150, Marcion, who was a Greek, once again represented the Nordic idea of a world order based on organic tension and hierarchical structure. This was in direct contrast to the Semitic conception of a capricious God who exercised a boundless despotism. Marcion therefore rejected the Old Testament as the "Book of Laws" of so false a deity. Similar efforts were made by a few of the Gnostics. But Rome, now racially polluted beyond redemption, was utterly committed to Africa and Syria, and smothered the simple essence of Jesus with the accretions of late Roman goals of world empire and ecumenical church.

The conflicts of the earliest centuries of our era are not to be understood except as struggles of race souls against the hydra-headed racial chaos. In this the Near Eastern amalgam of superstition, insane magic and sensual "mysteries" gathered to itself all that was chaotic, broken, and degenerate, thus infecting Christianity with that schismatic character which still afflicts it to this day. Thus a servile religion, its true nature disguised through the misuse of the great personality of Jesus, entered Europe. Emergent Christianity, derived from a multiplicity of sources, demonstrated an astounding combination of abstract spirituality and demonic sorcery, as well as exceptional powers of infiltration irrespective of other currents which were assimilated in it. The Idea of the Trinity, for example, was familiar to many of the peoples of the Mediterranean basin in the form of the Father, the Mother and the Son, and in the precept "Everything divides threefold." The mother symbolized the fertile earth, the father the creative principle of light. Now, in place of the mother there appears the "Holy Ghost" as a conscious retreat from the purely physi-

cal. Such was the *hagion pneuma* of the Greeks, the *prana* of the Indians.

This spirituality and its emphasis were not rooted in a racial-national ground conditioned by the polarity of organic life. Instead it became a force without direction.

"Here is neither Jew nor Greek, here is neither slave nor free, here is neither man nor woman," wrote Paul to the Galatians—that last remnant of a great Keltic migration down the Danube valley and into Asia Minor. On the basis of this nihilism, which is a denial of everything organic, he then calls for a belief in Christ. This constituted a total rejection of all the culture creating values of Greece and Rome—although to be sure, Christianity took over a degenerate form of such values—and effected their disintegration. Thanks to its strongly exculsive character, Christianity was then able to gather to itself all those who had lost direction.

A further step toward the denial of natural life lay in the dogmatic assertion of the Virgin Birth. Yet this is commonly a part of a solar myth to be found among various peoples from northern Europe to the South Sea islands.

Abstract spirituality, however, was flanked on each side by all the magic of Asia Minor, Syria and Africa. The demons which were driven out by Jesus and passed into the swine; the calming of the stormy sea at his command; his "certified" resurrection from the dead; his ascent into heaven—all these were the real point of departure for Christianity and undoubtedly greatly strengthened the ability to endure much suffering.

Thus the world did not proceed from the *life* of the Saviour (*Soter*) but from his death and its miraculous consequences. This is the single *motif* of the Pauline epistles. Goethe, on the contrary, held that it was the life of Christ which was important, not his death. In this he was attesting to the soul of the Germanic West expressed in positive Christianity as opposed to negative Christianity based on priesthood and witch mania and deriving from Etruscan-Asiatic concepts.

As we have indicated earlier, it is misleading when our scholars represent the transformation of Greek life as if there had been a development from chthonic gods to a deity of light and from matriarchy to patriarchy. It is equally false when they speak of a naive popular outlook which later ascended to lofty thought. In reality, alongside the anti-chthonic struggle, in the later predominance of intellectual doctrinal systems, in the attempt to exert political restraint over the earlier, unconstrained ways, there occurs a drying up of creative racial powers. In the end, we have only the Platonic reaction which strove to attain by artifice what the blood alone was already too weak to achieve.

The Nordic Greek recognized no separate priestly caste. His priests came from the aristocratic families. His singers and poets related to him the deeds and acts of his heroes and his gods. The free Greek spirit was as alien to dogmatism as was the earlier Indian and the later Teuton. Gymnastics and music were the substance of his education and these established the necessary prerequisites for the production of the hoplite, the citizen of the State. Only a Socrates could preach such insanity as that virtue could be *taught* and imparted to *all* men, an idea further refined by Plato. He who should really understand the nature of the world of ideas must of necessity be virtuous. With the promulgation of such an individualistic and raceless world-view, the axe was truly laid at the roots of Greek life.

At the same time, this rootless intellectualism permitted the recrudescence of all those Asiatic practices which had been put to flight by Apollonian Greek discipline. Here we can follow with absolute objectivity the alternating play which takes place between intellectualism and magic. Both reason and will, if not always consciously, pursue the same goal. Both are true to nature, blood-determined and organically conditioned. To the degree to which the rational world-view becomes unsure of its validity because of the changed nature of those who represent it, it also becomes too narrow for rational constructs. At the same time, that part which is based on *will* degenerates into magic and the proliferation of one superstition after another. The result of the disintegration of the rational-willed race soul is a world view based on an intellectual-magical substructure—when it is not merely meaningless individualism and unbridled bastardy. In the former case, the Catholic church and, to a lesser extent, Protestantism provide intellectual justifications for a magical belief. Late Hellenism offers an example of the latter.

Negative and positive Christianity were locked in conflict from the beginning and that conflict is today being waged with ever more bitterness. The negative type emphasizes its Levantine-Etruscan tradition, its abstract dogmas and hoary old customs; the positive consciously calls upon the Nordic blood to awaken, just as in their simple innocence the first Teutons did when they pressed into Italy bringing renewed vigor to that sick land.

Like a mighty and awesome primordial destiny, the Cimbri had once stormed in from the North. An initial repulse could not stay the Nordic Kelts and Teutons from repeatedly pressing upon the frontiers of Rome. In campaign after campaign the military skill of the Romans proved ineffectual against the rude strength of a young people. Giant blond

"slaves" began to appear on the streets of Rome and the Germanic ideal of beauty became fashionable among a decadent people bereft of all ideals of their own. Free Teutons also were soon no rarity in Rome. More and more the Caesars came to depend for support on the loyalty of the Germanic soldiery. Yet at the same time the Germans came to constitute the greatest threat to the existence of the wretched State now without values of its own. By imposing fines on bachelors, subsidizing marriage, and public welfare, Augustus attempted to regenerate his "own" people. It was in vain. Teutons were instrumental in the election of Claudius, of Galba, and of Vitellius. Marcus Aurelius sent his Teutonic prisoners from Vienna to Italy where instead of making them into gladiators he had them farm the long desolate soil. By the time of Constantine, the "Roman" army was almost entirely Germanic. Whoever cannot see racial forces at work here must be blind to all historical processes. It is patently obvious that both decomposition and rebirth are present in this. The regenerative process continues past Constantine to Stilicho, Alaric, Ricimer, Odoacer, Theodoric, the Langobards and to the Normans. These last named started by establishing a kingdom in the south which reached its apogee under the incomparable Friedrich II whose Sicilian kingdom became the first secular world State and whose provinces were settled by German nobility.

In this process of Nordicizing Italy, the work of Theodoric the Great was particularly significant. For more than thirty years this strong, yet generous and gentle ruler governed Italy. What Marcus Aurelius and Constantine had begun, he continued. The Teutonic settlers now became not merely tenant farmers and smallholders but also the owners of large estates. One-third of all the landed property passed into the hands of the Germanic soldiery. Although unfortunately widely dispersed, nevertheless more than 200,000 Germanic families settled in Tuscany and around Ravenna and Venice. Once again Nordic hands drove the plow through the soil of middle Italy and made the hitherto impoverished and desolate land fruitful and independent of the grain imports from North Africa.

Set apart from the indigenous population by their adherence to the Arian denomination and by laws prohibiting intermarriage, the Goths and the later Langobards played the same character-forming role as had the first Nordic immigrants for old Republican Rome. Racial amalgamation only began with the conversion of the Germanic Christians from the Aryan creed to Roman Catholicism.

At last came the Renaissance as a thunderous reassertion of Nordic-Germanic blood. With a sudden shattering of constricting social barriers, there arose from the cultivated soil one genius after another. Meanwhile,

all of Africanized Italy south of Rome remained mute and uncreative until today when Fascism, again arising from the north, is attempting to reawaken the old values. *Attempting!*

* * *

Even before the appearance of the work of Houston Chamberlain, it had long been common knowledge that all the creative values of the nations of the West were of Teutonic origins. Chamberlain recognized as self-evident that with the increasing dilution of this Germanic blood there would be a concomitant waning of the nation-creating and type-forming creativity which was its function, and that the entire culture of the West must perish.

New studies of prehistory support Chamberlain's thesis, and in combination with ethnology have spurred ever more serious reflection. Today, we have the terrible awareness that we are face to face with a final decision. Either we upbreed the old blood and thereby find renewed vitality and a heightened will to struggle, or the Teutonic-European values of culture and ordered government will sink under the filthy human flood of Cosmopolis; crippled on the hot and sterile asphalt of a bestialized subhumanity; or, perhaps, infiltrate like plague bacilli into South America, China, the Dutch East Indies and Africa, where ultimate bastardization will overtake them.

There is another feature of Chamberlain's thought which is of decisive importance today. Besides his emphasis upon the creation of a new world through German influence, he understood that an historical interval lay between the old Nordic Rome and the new Germanic West and that this intervening epoch was characterized by unchecked race-mixing. He saw this bastardization as the welling-up of everything diseased, of Levantine superstitions and sensual excesses until the febrile psyche of the population permeated the entire world. Chamberlain, with the consummate artistry of a seminal historian, called this period; the age of racial chaos. Even if its temporal limits defy precise demarcation, an awareness of this process has become widely disseminated and is self-evident to those possessed of deeper insight.

This new periodization in the place of "Antiquity" and the "Middle Ages," was one of the greatest discoveries of the late nineteenth century and forms the basis for all our studies of history as the twentieth century advances. This new insight means that if no Theodoric had followed the Caracallas the darkness would have descended forever upon Europe. It is

probable that the roiling morass of Asiatic and African half-breeds—indeed of all the peoples of the Mediterranean littoral—would have eventually settled, after wild excesses. Life, ever resurgent, would probably have eliminated much that was decayed and deformed. Eternally lost, however, would have been the creative power of a soul which had continuously created new cultures. Vanished forever would have been the world-transforming genius of that universally questing Nordic man. Only an undifferentiated humanity would have remained to perpetuate a vegetable existence, much as it does in southern Italy today—not living, but brutishly surviving without bold visions of body and soul, without any real yearnings, dwelling in deep, submissive contentment on lava masses or amid stony wastes.

Therefore, if even today, some 2,000 years after the first appearance of the Teutons in history, there still exist in some places national cultures, creative abilities and a daring spirit of enterprise, such forces, even though they contend greatly with each other, owe their very existence to that new Northern wave which enveloped and fertilized everything, passing stormy floods over the whole of Europe, washing around the feet of the Caucasus, sending its surf beyond the pillars of Hercules—and only ebbing away in the deserts of North Africa.

Seen in its broad outlines, the history of Europe is the history of the struggle between this new human type and the forces of Roman race-chaos, which, numbering in the millions, stretched from the Danube to the Rhine. This dark tide carried some glittering values on its surface and catered to some nerve-tingling lusts; its waves spoke of a past of once mighty world dominion and of a religion which answered all questions.

A considerable number of the Nordics succumbed to the seductive enticements with careless, even childlike, abandon. Thus they became themselves the servants of a kind of dream of ancient Roman grandeur. Too often they fought throughout the world in the cause of a fantasy and so became, instead of the progenitors they had been, merely the inheritors. Until Martin Luther appeared on the scene, such was the form taken by the struggle between the Teuton and the forces of race chaos. It became an internecine struggle between kindred-based heroism and heroism in the service of an alien fantasy. Frequently, those who confronted each other in war to defend mortally opposed values were of the same race. It is only too easy to understand how the representatives of this race, pouring out of the North German plain in a natural and violent manner into Gaul, Spain and Italy, were not wholly conscious of their own spiritual characteristics. With astonished eyes, they took to themselves

that which was both new and alien and—as masters—ruled over it. If they reshaped it, they also—as a minority—had to compromise with the new situation. Today, those supporters of "national rights" who yet preach the ideal of a "united mankind" and laud a single, organized, visible, ecumenical church which is to determine and embrace all public life, all science, all art, all ethics, on the basis of a single dogma, display the end result of those ideas, born of racial chaos, which have poisoned our true nature through the centuries. This is exemplified by the kind of commentator who says: "What Austria is striving for, the whole world must attain on a vaster scale." This is racial pollution and spiritual murder elevated to a world political program.

Emperor and Pope once fought for this universalist and anti-national idea; opposed to it were the German kings. Martin Luther created a national-political idea as against the Papal world monarchy. Developments in England, France, Scandinavia and Prussia gave added strength to this defense against chaos. The rebirth of Germany in 1813 and 1871 moved things a stage further but still always unconsciously, as it were, striving toward the goal. The collapse of 1918 tore apart our very vitals but at the same time laid bare to the searching soul the threads which had woven their fabric of mixed blessings. From the tribal consciousness of ancient Germania, by way of the ideas of the German kings, through the new leadership of Prussia and the faith in a united Germany, there is born today, as the greatest flowering of the German soul, a racially-based *Volk*-consciousness. On the basis of this experience we hail as the religion of the German future the fact that, though lying now politically prostrate, humiliated and persecuted, we have found the roots of our strength and have actually discovered and experienced them anew with such force as no previous generation has known.

At last, mythic feeling and conscious perception no longer confront each other as antagonists but as allies. Passionate nationalism is no longer directed toward tribal, dynastic or theological loyalties, but toward that primal substance, the racially-based *Volkheit* itself. Here is the message which will one day melt away all dross, eliminate all that is base and bring into being all that is noble.

Further research will reveal, as well as the Germanic struggle against race chaos, the line taken by other indigenous or infiltrated races of Europe. It will be able to assess the formerly more submissive and more indifferent Mediterranean race which is not entirely at odds with Germanic values. It will show that, as long as it is not a mass phenomenon,

many a mixture with it is not an unconditional loss but often an enrichment of soul. It will acknowledge the less culturally creative Dinaric race which, gifted with a robust temperament, nonetheless, has often played an effective role in great European dramas. But it will take into account also that its Near Eastern admixture produces symptoms of bastardy as, for example, can be seen in Austria and in the Balkans. The newly enlightened observer can next see how the unenterprising, brunet Alpine race, which is nevertheless well endowed with powers of resistance, patiently pushes forward and multiplies. The Alpine does not openly rebel against the dominant Teuton. Here and there, by mass penetration, it actually increases in individual cases the Germanic powers for tenacious resistance. But it also beclouds the creative talents, overlays and smothers them. Great areas of France, Switzerland and Germany already show the stigmata of Alpine influence which is inimical to all that is great. Political democracy, spiritual sterility, cowardly pacificism combined with craftiness in business and a lack of principle in commercial enterprises when profit is in view, these are the awful signs of an Alpine influence over European life.

All the great and bloody struggles of the Teutons against the Roman race chaos weakened, often for a considerable time, the vitality of the former. Moreover, even though Alpine man was not infrequently involved in wars, he was nevertheless spared far more than the Nordic insurgents who, initially as "heretics," cleared a path for free thought, that is, thought linked to racial type.

If we overlook the early struggle of the Arians for religious liberty, the entire West, once Romish political power was consolidated, demonstrates the lack of a self-contained, organically-rooted way of life. If the victorious ecumenical Roman Church was the lineal descendant of the raceless Late Roman Empire, even if the Roman emperors constituted themselves the most powerful arm of this idea, even if highly gifted members of Germanic families placed themselves at the service of its seductions, nevertheless everywhere and in all domains the counter-forces straightaway began to stir. Politically, this occurred with the German kings and French Gallicanism; in ecclesiastical matters, in the struggle of the bishops against the Curia; spiritually, in the demand for freedom of natural inquiry; in philosophy and theology, in the call for freedom of thought and belief. Although in the earlier period these forces still sometimes paid obeisance to Rome as an idea and were often not fully aware of the significance of their demands—even if they were, perhaps, borne upward by the naive hope of cleansing the Church—they were, in the last anal-

ysis, forces of ardent nationalism. We recognize in them a racially-linked, resolute and subconscious mode of thought and feeling against any variety of universalism.

The authority of a king or duke, territorial limits to episcopal sees, and personal freedom—are all directly rooted in the soil, even though these forces competed, and still do, for ascendancy. If it is clear now that it was the most purely Nordic-Germanic states, peoples and tribes which most consistently and resolutely defended themselves against the assault on everything organic by Roman ecumenical conformism, then we shall be able to see that even *before* the great victorious awakening of those forces from the hypnotic influence of Rome and the Levant there was an heroic struggle in progress directly linked to the still "pagan" Teutons. The history of the Albigensians, Waldenses, Cathars, Arnoldists, Stedingers, Huguenots, the Reformed Church and the Lutherans, as well as of the martyrs of free inquiry and the heroes of Nordic philosophy, draws an impressive picture of a gigantic contest for *character values*, those prerequisites of soul and spirit without the assertion of which there could have been neither European nor national culture.

Whoever looks at modern France, democratized, misgoverned by crafty lawyers, plundered by Jewish bankers, spiritually glittering but living now only on its past, could scarcely imagine that this land once stood from end to end as the focal area of heroic struggles and, for over half a millenium, produced figures of the boldest type who were succeeded, generation after generation, by men of heroic disposition. Who among the "cultured" of today actually knows anything about Gothic Toulouse, the ruins of which still attest to a proud race? Who knows of the great ruling families of that city which were annihilated in bloody wars? Who is familiar with the history of the Counts of Foix, whose castle is today only a miserable heap of stones, whose villages are desolate, whose lands are occupied only by wretched peasants? "The Pope," declared one of these bold counts, *circa* 1200, "has nothing to do with my religion, because the faith of each man must be free." This fundamentally Germanic idea, which even today is only partially realized, cost southern France its finest blood and was smothered forever with its extermination in this region. As a last vestige of the Visigothic spirit, Montauban, France's only Protestant college, is still to be found there.

The same heroism inspired a tiny people dwelling in the midst of the Italo-French Alps. Here, the will that welded them all together goes back to a great and mysterious personality, a merchant of Lyon who had migrated to that city (we still do not know from where) and whose name

opened to them. Yet another group fled into Lombardy. There it found similar heresies being spread by, among others, the Patarians in Milan and the teachings of Arnold of Brescia who strove beyond what was purely evangelical for ecclesiastical as well as political reform, and who denied the Pope a title to temporal power as a prerequisite for his spiritual health.

Next the community of the Waldensians poured into the valleys in the western slopes of the Alps and gained a foothold in the districts with the poorer soils which, thanks to the diligence of their hands, blossomed into fruitful gardens. They had no wish but to live quietly and modestly in their faith and to fulfill their evangelical duties on this earth. But at length the bells of the Inquistion began to peal throughout the West. Even the quiet valleys with their two little towns and twenty villages were plunged into tumult. By the mid-fourteenth century, the Waldensians were having to pay heavy tribute to appease the Church and the lords of the land—which were naturally, at that time, unproductive. This was the period when the Black Death raged in the German districts. French troops, under the direct command of the Inquisitor, moved into the quiet Alpine valleys. Twelve Waldensians were first taken in chains to the church. They were garbed in yellow gowns on which were painted the flames of hell. Anathema was pronounced against them, their shoes were removed, each had a rope tied around his neck, and they were then all burned at the stake. These and other tortures broke the resistance of many, causing them to recant. However, these reverses only brought further humiliations in their wake. Fresh revolts broke out and inevitably brought about fresh repressions. An epic of human struggle began which has seldom been equalled for heroic conduct. The Waldensians were stripped of all their property and filled the prisons of the Inquistions in such numbers that they were only able to be fed through the generosity of the people.

However, their numbers were conveniently diminished by the usual expedient of being burnt by the officers of the religion of love. A single Inquisitor persecuted the Waldensian community. For thirteen years, he was repeatedly successful in catching many of them who had made some heretical remark. Prisoners were then tortured on the rack, had their hands cut off, were strangled or burned alive. In spite of this, the Archbishop of Embrum had to report to the Pope that the Waldensians remained obdurate in their faith.

At this time, when from every part of Europe the storm winds of a rebirth were rattling the gates of Rome, the deputy of the Vatican marched with the French troops once more into the Alpine valleys in

order to trample down with military might the remaining resistance.

In 1487, the vicious Innocent VIII issued a papal Bull calling for the final extermination of the Waldensians. Under the command of La Palus, the crusade began. The houses of the heretics were looted and the inhabitants massacred. Most of those who survived did so by fleeing. The few who remained behind in the ruins of their ancestral dwellings were seemingly broken and ready to make their peace with the almighty Church. Their property was then returned to them.

A period of quiet, however, proved not to be peace but only a prelude to new storms. Scarely forty years later, simple faith again triumphed over the material might of medieval terror. Again Rome gathered its strength for the kill. The Edict of Fontainebleau (1540) had given fresh impetus to the hatred of heretics. It began when sixteen Waldensians of Merindol were denounced by the bishop and required to appear to answer charges. Knowing what fate awaited them, they did not present themselves. They were thereupon declared outlaw and their houses, wives and children the property of the State. The little town of Merindol was to be laid waste, all buildings destroyed, all trees chopped down. Should they recant, the king expressed the wish that mildness would prevail. The Waldensians replied, however, that they would only be willing to recant if their errors could be proved to them from Scripture.

Now, in 1545, came the severest trial. The soldiers of the secular authority marched into Merindol, strangled everyone they found there, and destroyed the entire little town. Calvieres and the other villages suffered a like fate. Those who had fled into the mountains begged a safe passage to Germany. This being refused, they starved to death in their hiding places. Altogether, over twenty-two villages were destroyed, 3,000 people murdered, more than 600 Waldensians condemned to the galleys, and others most horribly tortured. Then false reports were dispatched to Paris concerning the "atrocities of the heretics." However, the tortures inflicted by the inflamed soldiery and sadistic monks reached the ears of Francis I, and even on his death bed he urged Henry II to ease the plight of the Waldensians, which the latter, in fact, did.

The Waldensian community, despite its wide dispersal, was not very strong and consequently lacking in aggressive thrust. Nevertheless, the idea of resistance to monkish degeneracy and spiritual gagging permeated France in a hundred other forms. It was a France which was at that time still Germanic-Nordic in character and well supplemented by a Mediterranean element.

Eventually, all these currents came together in the bold Huguenot movement which, had it been victorious, would have given the history of Western Europe another impetus—an upward one.

The numbers of those who fought for a life which would be true to their racial type was extraordinarily large in the France of the time. They were to be found in all classes and all professions, from cardinals and princes of the blood down to the humblest artisan. Hundreds of recorded cases tell us of simple folk, dragged before the clerical and secular courts, who proved to be more learned in the Scriptures than those who sat in judgement on them, and who could give more intelligent answers to questions of the creed than the "learned" Inquisitors.

This knowledge of their own superiority gave them the fortitude to face the torments of the stake. Often enough, it led the judges themselves to professions of support for the heretical idea.

This is hardly surprising if one is aware that the most abysmal ignorance was not only evident among the lower clergy, but that there were even (as Robert Stephanus tells us) professors of theology at the Sorbonne who, in their rage against the heretics, declared that they themselves had reached the age of fifty without knowing anything about the New Testament. and therefore a layman had no business to concern himself with it.

About the year 1400, the Pope netted some 100,000 gulden from the sale of indulgences in German lands alone. In England, in 1374, parliament estimated that the Vicar of Christ pocketed five times the amount of taxes that fell to their own king. The identical complaint, all too justified, was raised throughout France. All classes groaned under the burden of Church taxes. Indeed, honest monks, like the Franciscans Vitriarius and Meriot, demanded the abolition of the unworthy trade in indulgences. In the same way as with the Holy Blood of Wilsnack, so also was the corrupt trade carried on at the Holy House of Loreto (which the angels were supposed to have carried to Europe from Palestine) and these "miraculous" places proved to be veritable gold mines. Church benefices multiplied so profusely that Calvin was made a curate at the age of twelve and a priest at eighteen, although he had never previously undertaken the necessary theological studies. The income from benifices had to be secured regardless of personal qualifications.

Such evils led to much critical reflection and, as a result, a succession of heroic figures experienced the flames of the stake. There was the Archbishop of Arles, Louis Allemand, who, at Council of Basel, defended the principle of the Conciliar Movement with his utmost strength against

Papal dictatorship. There was shrewd old Jacob Lefevre, who worked toward the education of a free younger generation and whose work was continued by his pupil Briconnet. There was William Farel, a fiery spirit, who placed himself in the midst of the struggle and who later became a leading reformer in Neuchatel, Lausanne and Geneva. There were also Casoli and Michael d'Arnande. There were the aristocratic Burgundian Languet and the brilliant Beza and Hotoman. Above all, there towers that courageous and bold nobleman from Artois, Louis de Berquin, amid a mighty band. A man of faith, full of frankness and clarity of vision, he was a superb writer and has been called, not unjustly, the French Ulrich von Hutten. With him, there was the simple wool carder from Meaux, Jean Leclerc, who preached revolution against the Antichrist in Rome, and who, like Luther, nailed his proclamation to the cathedral doors. There was the heroic Pouvan who suffered a martyr's death, and Franz Lambert, a Franciscan, and a hundred others who preached the freedom of the Gospel and of thought in forests and cellars as the best of the early Christians had once done in the Roman catacombs.

Even before the Huguenot movement had taken a firm hold in France and found some protection under the leadership of Conde and the great Admiral Coligny, the same persecution had spread over the whole land as in the quiet valleys of the Alpes Cottiennes and in Provence. Berquin the Bold was seized and ordered to recant. His tongue was pierced with red-hot pincers and he was condemned to life imprisonment. He did not recant and, instead, appealed to the king. It was in vain. He was finally burned at the stake on the 22nd of April 1527. Even from the flames he spoke to the people, but his speech was drowned out by the howls of the monks and the executioners: they feared him even in death.

It has been reported of Nero that he caused his gardens to be illuminated with burning human torches. In the sixteenth century of our Lord, His Most Christian Majesty, the King of France, walked in stately procession from St. Germain l'Auxerrois to Notre Dame and thence to his palace. On the squares which he had to traverse, there stood to the glory and honor of the Holy Mother Church, the stakes and the wood piles whereon unyielding heretics were to suffer death amid the fires. Twenty-four heretics died thus on that day in Paris.

The victims of persecution began to flee to Germany for refuge. Among them were Calvin, Roussel, and Marot. Savage edicts for the persecution of heretics followed rapidly one upon the other. In Meaux, the first Protestant community in France, an assembly was taken by surprise. When they refused to recant, fourteen suffered death by burning. They

died calling out prayers to one another. The day after, a theological scholar from the Sorbonne proved that those who were burned were also consigned to eternal damnation. He added: "And if an angel came down from heaven and wished to assure us of the contrary, we would have to reject this; for God would not be God if He did not damn them forever."

Just as in Meaux so throughout France the fires of the stake flared skyward. But again and again the chronicles attest to the unbroken courage of the condemned. Jean Chapot was carried to the place of execution because the torturers had previously broken his legs. As he continued to proclaim his faith, he was quickly strangled lest his heretical ideas infect the onlookers. After this, because similar cases were occurring all over, it became the practice to cut out the tongues of obdurate heretics before leading them to the stake—*ad majorem dei gloriam!*

History not only records a great number of well-authenticated stories of the heroism of those burned at the stake, it also reports many conversions among the judges themselves. Such was the case of the courageous Du Bourg, who calmly accepted his sentence of death and was strangled. There were numerous similar cases among other men of the France of those days. The great tragedies of individual heroism and agony were transformed, however, into bold, skillful and joyous counterattack when the best of the French higher nobility stood as Huguenots at the head of the struggle for freedom of thought. The fight against Romish power was waged in eight bloody wars throughout the length and breadth of France. The dispute over holy communion, which appeared generally as the principal doctrinal conflict, was really only a superficial manifestation of a much deeper spiritual division. Coligny, when he later held power, demonstrated his basic outlook by demanding freedom of belief not only for himself but also for the Catholics of Chatillon.

Since, however, the Huguenots found themselves confronted by absolute rigidity and the representatives of Rome demanded compliance on that basis, the Protestants were left no recourse but to institute gradually a similarly sharply-defined canon which quite naturally, because it was essentially *unnatural*, brought the various Protestant sects into conflict with one another. But underlying all these things was the much deeper and primal Germanic idea of inner freedom. New doctrines and new forms became only symbols of resistance to Roman dogmas. Thus the Mass was opposed by almost all Huguenots.

In the souls of the Huguenot aristocracy, there arose a dichotomy which severely handicapped their cause. While they demanded absolute free-

dom of conscience and teaching, they were compelled to put their demands to a king to whom they were devoted in a civil and political respect according to the ancient Frankish concept of fealty. The king, however, was not only a Catholic but saw in a uniformity of religion a necessary feature of the security of the body politic. In this way it came about that when later the Huguenot forces gathered at Orleans and La Rochelle against the king, and fought against his armies at Jarnac, St. Denis and Moncontour, they still, with complete sincerity, proclaimed their loyalty and passed resolutions in which they claimed that the king was not free but a captive of the Roman party. This view was confirmed in their eyes after each conclusion of peace.

Even at the zenith of their strength, the Huguenots were still only a minority. Their advantages lay in the skill and energy of their leaders, in the heroism of a new feeling for life and in the resurgent call of their ancient blood. Their enemies, on the other hand, were weakened by disputes among their leaders and the constant fear of the king that his generals, such as Anjou, would become too powerful.

The massacre at Vassy, where the Duke of Guise had the Huguenots slaughtered as they knelt in prayer, was one of the first indications that it was to be a fight to the bitter end. And so the Huguenots, always prepared for sacrifices, responded when the call to arms came from the great Conde. In spite of some defeats, the Huguenots managed to take more and more fortresses, castles, and cities, and sought now in the north and in the south to establish their own strongholds.

In these wars the finest of the ancient French blood was spilled on the battlefields by each side. Thus died the old Constable Montmorency who fought, not from religious hatred like the Guises, but as a loyal vassal of his king. He ended his life on the field of St. Denis at the age of seventy-four. Then, one by one, all the Protestant leaders fell with Andelot and Conde at their head. Disdaining his broken thigh, the great prince leaped in front of his army at Jarnac: "Well then, ye nobles of France, here is the battle we have awaited so long." His horse was wounded and fell. An enemy captain then struck him down from behind.

Even after a favorable peace, a frightful fate awaited the Huguenot troops on coming home. The inflamed Catholic majority plundered their houses, drove out their families and murdered the returning soldiers. After the Peace of Longjumeau, for example, such pogroms were deliberately organized by the authorities. Lyons, Amiens, Troyes, Rouen, Socissons and other cities witnessed a bloody frenzy which claimed more victims among the Protestants than had the war itself in six whole

months. Contemporary writers estimated the number of those slain after the conclusion of peace at 10,000. By contrast Moncontour, probably the most bloody of the battles fought later, cost only about 6,000. Simultaneously an incessant stream of hatred poured out from Rome demanding the complete annihilation of heretics. Pius V castigated the French king because he had made concessions to the Huguenots and praised those of his subjects like the Duke of Nemours who continued the slaughter in defiance of the king's decrees. The Pope promised money and soldiers and called for yet more blood to be shed. His biographer, Gabutius, extols Pius V as the instigator of the third Huguenot war. Not even the victory of Jarnac and the death of Conde satisfied this Vicar of Christ. His benedicitions were combined with the injunction to exterminate all heretics, even the prisoners of war. He called down the anger of God in advance upon any weakening. He continued in this vein after the Peace of St. Germain and incited the king's subjects against the court.

Yet it still seemed as though the old Germanic character would triumph in the end. The court had already once been under Huguenot influence and in place of debauched revels there had entered into the royal palaces a hard, even narrow-minded, sobriety. Once more the Huguenots gained acceptance when Charles IX summoned Coligny to his service. To the leader of the heretics he said, "I bid you welcome as no nobleman has been welcomed for twenty years!" Thus for a brief time a new hand guided the destiny of France—until everything was destroyed in the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Eve. Vacillating, characterless, given to fits of maniacal rage, the king inclined to the Roman faction and they pushed him into the murder of Coligny.

Now there was no turning back. The Germanic tide, which had seemed about to sweep triumphantly through France, collapsed. When Coligny's bloody corpse was thrown before the feet of the Duke of Guise, the latter wiped the blood from Coligny's face and said contemptuously, "Yes indeed, that is he," and proceeded to kick the cadaver. Meanwhile in Rome, at the Castle of St. Angelo, the massacre was celebrated with public holidays and a special coin was minted in honor of Coligny's murderer. In Paris, the pious rabble even cut off the hands of France's great hero and dragged the corpse for three days through the filth of the streets.

The end was fast approaching. The remaining Huguenot leaders who had gathered in Paris for the wedding [of Henry of Navarre to Margaret of Valois, (Ed.)] either perished in the bloodbath of St. Bartholomew's Eve

or were slaughtered after fleeing to other areas. In Orleans, 1,500 men, as well as numerous women and children, were murdered in the course of five days; in Lyons, 1,800 perished. Day after day the cities of Provence witnessed mutilated corpses floating down the rivers. Arles could draw no drinking water from the river for many days. In Rouen, the maddened *canaille* murdered 800 people in two days; in Toulouse, 300.

The tall, blond Huguenot women—distinctive as ever—whose menfolk had been treacherously murdered, were frequently subjected to the most obscene indignities at the hands of the rabble which was egged on by foul-mouthed monks and priests. The mob, with the blessing of the Church, showed no mercy to the heretics. The final results of St. Bartholomew's Eve were more than 70,000 slain.

When later struggles brought no success, hundreds of thousands of Huguenots preferred to leave a spiritually oppressed France. Prussia, England, and the Netherlands reckon the descendants of these emigres (estimated at almost two million) as among the finest of their fellow citizens.

The decisive fact that emerges from all this blood-letting is, however, the deterioration of the character of the French nation. That true pride, that unbending resolution, that nobility of mind, which the early Huguenot leadership epitomized, was lost. When in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, "Classical" French philosophy undermined Church dogma and brought it into disrepute, it was certainly imbued with much acuteness of intellect and scintillating wit. Nevertheless, it is evident with Rousseau and even with Voltaire that it lacked genuine nobility of mind such as distinguished Berquin, Conde, Coligny and Teligny. This intellectualism was abstract and divorced from life and in this way the 14th of July 1789 was a symbol of impotence of character. The revolution under Coligny had been a true and full-blooded one while the events of 1793 were merely blood-thirsty and sterile because they were not sustained by anyone of great character. No geniuses inspired the Girondins and Jacobins—only insane philistines, egomaniacal demagogues and those hyenas of the political battlefields who plunder the forlorn corpses.

Just as in Russia during the Bolshevik revolution the Tartarized subhumans murdered anyone who, by their tall stature and confident carriage looked suspiciously like an aristocrat, so also did the swart Jacobin rabble drag to the scaffold anyone who was slender and blond. Expressed in terms of racial history with the destruction of the Huguenots, the Nordic racial strength in France was, if not absolutely eliminated, at least seriously weakened. Classical France displayed only intellect without

greatness of soul. This decline of character was instinctively realized by the hungry masses who joined with the rapacious subhuman elements to do away with the last men of quality. Since that time, the mixed Mediterranean-Alpine type (not the "Kelt") has stepped into the foreground. The shopkeepers, lawyers, and speculators have become the masters of public life. Democracy, which is to say the rule of money rather than of character, had arrived. Now it no longer mattered whether France was a monarchy or a republic; the nineteenth-century citizenry remained racially uncreative. For that very reason, the Jewish banker was able to push himself to the front, followed by Jewish journalists and Jewish Marxists. Only the tradition of a thousand years of history and the enduring geographical factors still continued to determine the basic thrust of French power politics. But this was manifested in a very different manner than in the period between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. Whoever was still of noble disposition in France withdrew from the dirty business of politics and lived in conservative seclusion on provincial estates from which their sons left only to serve the fatherland in the army, and especially in the navy. Even at the end of the nineteenth century, observers at naval balls were astonished to discover that all the officers were blond.

This strength, which still existed in northern France (Normandy was always regarded during the time of heresies as "Little Germany"), was what confronted the German Reich in 1914. It was a strength, however, which was no longer under the direction of leaders of the same race but under Rothschild bankers and other financial interests of that breed. In addition there were the types of Fallieres or Millerand and the Alpine inadequacies of many of the Marxist leaders. Today, the very last few drops of the valuable blood are finally trickling away. Over vast stretches of the South, it has entirely disappeared and is now being replaced by African elements as was once the fate of Rome. The port cities of Toulon and Marseilles transmit unceasingly the germs of bastardization throughout the land. An ever more degenerate populace circumambulates the Notre Dame. Negroes and mulattoes stroll about on arms of white women. An exculsively Jewish quarter has arisen with new synagogues. Arrogant and repulsive mestizo-like creatures pollute the race of the still beautiful women who are drawn to Paris from the French provinces. It is a modern repetition of the tragedy which long overtook Persepolis, Athens and Rome.

This is why a close alliance with France, quite apart from the military and political aspects, would be racially so dangerous. On the contrary,

what is needed is a clarion call for defense against African infiltration, for the closing of frontiers on the basis of anthropological considerations, and the establishment of a Nordic-European coalition for the object of cleansing Mother Europe of the filth of Africa and the Levant. This would be in the true interests of the French themselves.

* * *

Today the history of the kingdom of the Franks is ended. It matters little whether France is governed by clerical power-seekers or inane "free thinkers;" the great creative impulse is moribund. France will henceforth be afflicted by an instinctual racial *Angst* which is the inescapable heritage of the crossbreed however superficially secure he may appear to be. It is this which accounts for the still obsessive fear of a Germany which was only overcome with the aid of the entire world. Germany, then, has the best of reasons for studying the life courses of its neighbors in order to arouse all its inner strength to avert the same dire fate.

Germany, predominantly Protestant, had no need for a Bastille Day. Although pressed back for a time by the spirit of Alpine-cum-Levantine Rome, a strong ring of resistance based on character was drawn around the Baltic basin and this thwarted the attempts of Rome to oppress it. Indeed, it directly compelled Rome to reform its moral life in order to survive at all.

But the Teuton has not, unfortunately, kept up his guard. Magnanimously, he conceded to alien blood those same rights which he had gained for himself as a result of his great sacrifices through the centuries. He carried tolerance of religious diversity and scientific speculation into areas where he would have done better to lay down strict limitations; the areas involving the creation of the national State and of the *Volk*-type. Such are the prerequisites for organic life in general. He failed to see that a spirit of tolerance as between Catholic and Protestant religious convictions was not at all the same thing as toleration of anti-Germanic racial values. Surely it is obvious that there is no equivalence of rights as between the stock market manipulator and the heroic man; or those who follow the un-Germanic laws of the Talmud cannot be accorded equal rights in shaping the national life as a Hanseatic merchant or a German officer.

This failure on the part of the Teuton was a sin against his own blood. From it there sprang that sense of a great national guilt. This, in turn,

resulted in the emergence of the "two Germanies," which had already been discernible in 1870-71 and which confronted each other irreconcilably after 1914, finally to fall apart in 1918 and are locked in a life-and-death struggle ever since. The struggle which was carried on during the wars of the heretics and at the time of Gustavus Adolphus is renewed in our own time but under different symbols. Such symbols are not simply those of an abstract theological nature but represent with overwhelming clarity an organic antithesis between what is Nordic-Germanic and the lesser races imbued with the spiritual nature of the Near East.

It was the blood-sacrifices of the nations upon the battlefields of the world which gave the democratic men of the East and their bastardized accomplices in the large cities the opportunity to achieve ascendancy. That human type which first began to gain predominance in the France of 150 years ago, has since 1918—financed by the wealth of the Levant—assumed the leadership of democracy in Germany. It is a type to which the older values are incomprehensible and which therefore fights openly and insolently against those values on every street and square. "The stupidest of ideals is the ideal of the hero," proclaims the *Berliner Tageblatt*. Honor was accorded to successful speculators. Eastern Jewish bankers became the sources of finance for the parties committed to "preserving the State," whereas those who fought against such a mockery of the Germanic character were thrown into prison on the charge of "attacking the form of government." This inversion of values is the inevitable accompaniment of the change in the ruling caste. A single glance at the line-up of the Marxist-democratic leadership demonstrates in a horrifying way the racial decline which had taken place between the time of Moltke, Roon, Bismarck and William I, and that of those parliamentarians who, until 1933, managed the German stock-exchange colony from Berlin.

The dominion of this cast-up Alpine-Jewish amalgam, at a time when the worthier part of the nation was living in dreadful despair, seemed assured as a result of its immediate and instinctive alliance with those forces governing present-day France—a France whose threadbare ideology it used to justify the spiritual poverty of the revolution of 1918. As it had achieved power through these false values, it was incapable of changing its course. German democracy, a form of French politics in Germany, originates in the last analysis from the natural affinity between decadent spirits which see upright character as a living reproach and thus seek to ally themselves with what is degenerate. This is also the explanation for the sympathy which post-revolutionary Russia calls forth in all

centers of Marxist subhumanity. Behind the glittering facade of touted principles, or *Realpolitik* considerations, there flows a current of subconscious racial power, a surging flood filled with the sewage of racial chaos. As this runs entirely counter to historical tradition and geo-political legitimacy, it is wholly destructive to the German nation.

Historians who deal with the painful history of the struggles between Rome and the heretics always declare that these events must be viewed on the basis of the world-picture and the conditions prevailing at that time. This is argued both by the defenders of Rome and by its accusers. In so doing, they have fallen victims to a fatal error. They have failed to see that, in addition to transitory circumstances, there exist immutable and basic laws which, although they contend in various forms, nevertheless remain constant in the direction of their effect. The struggle of Nordic man against Roman ecumenicalism is a 2000-year-old fact which has simultaneously been "a condition of the times." Therefore, an understanding of present events also retains its basic justification in assessing the contending forces of race and race-chaos in times past. But *what* perished in these conflicts of the past is precisely what has not been treated of by "competent" historians—the annihilation of racial substance in Southern France, the similar extermination of creative blood in the then still strongly Germanic core of Austria by the Counter-Reformation, and other resultant "conditions of the times."

Conventional historiography has sought to explain away what is immutable, so that what is really conditioned by the times is generally evaluated from only one aspect and its characteristics only superficially examined. With this realization, a new foundation has been laid for the furture recorders and researchers of Western development through study of the unchanging values of the race-soul which makes possible an ascending progress for the strong of heart.

The foregoing still requires some elaboration so that it does not appear as a superficial judgement of great questions. Consider the history of the Hussites. The Protestant movement in Bohemia exhibits a fundamental difference from that of France. In France there was a single language, a single tradition of government, and clear tendencies toward unified nationhood. In Bohemia, on the contrary, German and Czech confronted one another as forces separated in large part by race. The Czechs, for their part, were stratified by race into a Nordic-Slavic nobility and lower orders of an Alpine-Dinaric stamp, thus displaying that type which the modern Czech so plainly embodies. Under Anglo-Saxon influence (Wycliffe), the Slavic Czechs withdrew from Roman ecumenicalism in the same manner

as the emerging German nation or the Huguenots in France. This movement produced the so-called "Utraquist" Church which, in the *Articles of Prague* (August 1, 1420), demanded above all free preaching without subordination to higher ecclesiastical authorities. There followed the usual demands for holy communion, the dissolution of Church property, and the end of the practice of absolution for deadly sins through atonements prescribed by human authority. The free Czech clergy had to enlist the lower classes of their people in presenting these demands, which were answered with Papal Bulls. Here was revealed the alien nature of the Alpine-Dinaric type which manifested itself in barbarous savagery coupled with the grossest superstition. The one-eyed maniacal Ziska of Trocnow, whose head in the Prague National Museum shows him to have been an Eastern Hither-Asiatic type, was the first expression of this totally destructive Taborite movement, which the Czechs must thank for the extermination of the last remaining Germanic powers active within them, as well as the repression of all that was truly Slavic.

As if under the compulsion of Near Eastern insanity, the Taborite zealots declared: "In this time of retaliation, all cities, towns and fortresses must be devastated, razed to the ground and burned." This included Prague ("the Babylon of cities"). Chiliasm, which has also poisoned many other Protestant movements up to the present day, was imbibed from the Old Testament. It led Czech farmers to abandon their goods and property in imminent anticipation of the Kingdom of God on earth and this, in turn, to the looting of German property.

The Taborites declared war upon the Utraquists. By 1420, they had already proclaimed a doctrine which ever since has been echoed by all subhuman rebels against genius and the spirit of inquiry: "Every man who studies the liberal arts is frivolous and heathen." The genuine Czech patriots completely lost their senses just as did the Russian intellectuals in 1917 in the face of the rising Bolshevik menace. Here was a clear demonstration of Czech inferiority which wrung from Franz Palacky the admission in 1846 that the Germans of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries had acquired increasing superiority:

> From this we draw the unpleasant and distressing conclusion that something exists in the natures of the two peoples, Czech and German, which, quite apart from political conditions, endows the latter *vis-a-vis* the former, with a greater breadth of mind and ensures a continuing ascendancy [but] *that we possess some deep-rooted fault that eats like a canker at the core of our life.*

And when the "Czech national cause" triumphed and Czechs everywhere exulted, a terrible spiritual and moral decline set in for this very reason. The patriot Hassenstein sorrowfully declared: "Anyone who tries to live uprightly has to flee our fatherland." Another Czech nationalist, Viktorin von Wscherd confessed: "One can find almost no feature of our State which is not broken or weakened." Hassenstein's words in 1506 to a friend in Germany anticipate the observation by Palacky about a poison in the Czechs and, in alluding to the Germanic race as a healing force, sound like a yearning for a different kind of Czech. He wrote:

> Once, admittedly, under the Ottos, Heinrichs, Friedrichs, when Germany flourished, our power also grew . . . Bohemia was considered the noblest part of the *Reich*: but now, when your State system is shaken, we not merely tremble but utterly collapse . . . wars harry you; we are consumed by blight.

From the first, the German element, despite much sympathy for the anti-Roman cause, found itself driven back by the Hussite Taborite movement and this naturally led to an accommodation with the Papal forces. A simple instinct for self-preservation in the face of the rebellion of the Dinaric-Alpine people brought about a superficial identification with Rome but without essential inward harmony. In times of great revolutions, little is spared; Taboritism, however, cost the Czechs virtually everything they possessed in the way of their own cultural strength. Since that time, they have remained uncreative and have to thank for their eventual cultural recovery the later influx of German formative power. Barbarism coupled with pettiness has, unfortunately, remained a distinguishing characteristic of the Czechs to the present day. Equating the Reformation with the Nordic spirit is thus not valid in this context, for in many places the great Nordic ideal of freedom of soul and mind also released from beneficial forms men who possessed neither free souls nor the upward striving of an inquiring spirit.

The study of Czech history is extremely instructive for future research into race history. It teaches one how to distinguish between false and true freedom. Freedom in the Germanic sense means inward independence, the scope for research, the extension of knowledge, and true religious feeling. Freedom for Near Eastern hybrids and swart mongrels means unrestrained license to destroy other cultural values. The first kind had produced in Greece the highest cultural development. However, after the Levantine slave element was admitted to "humanity" total destruction of

its creations ensued. To grant outward "freedom" to everyone without distinction is to deliver oneself over to race chaos. Only freedom as a bond between racial kindred guarantees the highest development. But this requires protection of the racial type. This lesson also emerges from Czech history.

The 300,000 Huguenots who fled to Germany were either of pure Nordic race or were representatives of a type which was conditioned by Germanic character. There was thus no difficulty in assimilating in fraternal harmony with the Germans. When, in 1789, the French Revolution inaugurated a new persecution not only of dispossessed courtiers but also of genuinely noble characters, many a "Frenchman" found a new home in Prussia. Fouque, Chamisso and Fontane are French names, as are the names of a large number of German heroes of the Great War. On the other hand, Kant traced his ancestry to Scotsmen, Beethoven to Hollanders and H.S. Chamberlain, an Englishman, brought to light from their hidden depths the most beautiful treasures of the German soul. What all this shows is a happy cross-fertilization of men and ideas on the basis of a Germanic perception of life. Something utterly different is demonstrated today in the so-called Pan-Europeanism which is promoted by all internationalists and Jews. This program is not aimed at the assimilation of Germanic-conditioned elements in Europe but at the coalescing of the racially chaotic refuse of megalopolises and a pacifistic business deal between large and petty traders. In the final analysis, it is the repression, at the behest of Jewish finance and enforced by the presence of the French military, of the Germanic forces in Germany—and throughout the world.

The external State form which safeguarded German nationality has been smashed. The pseudo-State, until the turning point came in 1933, was controlled by anti-German forces. It was threatened in the West by the aggressive French who were, as always, hostile to all that is German. In the East, what is German has been enveloped by violent torrents. Originally Russia was the creation of Vikings. Germanic elements brought order to the chaos of the Russian steppes and formed the inhabitants into a political entity which made possible the development of a culture. When the Viking strain died out, the role was assumed by Germans of the Hanse, and by Western immigrants generally. Since Peter the Great, the Baltic Germans guided the State and this was to be seen even as late as the turn of the twentieth century in the influence of the strongly Germanized peoples of the Baltic littoral. But in Russia under the culture-bearing upper classes there always persisted the yearning for

boundless expansion and a powerful impetus to destroy all life forms which might constitute barriers to it. The partially Mongol blood, even if considerably diluted, asserted itself during all the upheavals in Russian history and impelled men into actions which have often seemed incomprehensible even to those who participated in them. The sudden inversion of all moral and social norms which is a recurring feature in Russian life (and in Russian literature from Chaadayev to Dostoevski and Gorki) is a sign that hostile bloodstreams contend with one another and that this struggle will not be resolved until the strength of one has triumphed over the other. Bolshevism is the revolt of the Mongol strain against the Nordic cultural forms. It is the longing for the steppes and the hatred of the nomad for the roots of personality, signifying an attempt to cast off Europe as a whole. The East Baltic race, which has many poetic gifts, shows itself, mixed as it is with a Mongol element, to be pliant clay either in the hands of Nordic leadership or under Jewish and Mongol tyrants. It sings and dances but as easily murders and ravages. It is capable of true devotion but once the restraints of discipline are removed it can become uninhibitedly treacherous until it is constrained by the imposition of new forms, even if they are tyrannical in nature.

If anywhere, it is in the East that the profound truths of racially-based historical interpretation are to be found. But also revealed is the great hour of peril in which the Nordic essence now finds itself. Forces eating away at the inside of every land, together with the aroused sewage of the lower depths, obligate everyone concerned about the total culture of Europe to create a solid front of Nordic destiny which will cut across the artificial confrontation of victors and vanquished of the Great War. This recognition lays a great duty upon all more deeply enquiring spirits and demands the development of exceptional strength of character.

At one time, the early Christians found a faith strong enough to enable them to endure all martyrdoms and persecutions. When Rome abused this commitment, hundreds of thousands in Europe arose anew, strong in faith, and continued the fight on the pyres of the stake for freedom of belief and freedom of enquiry. Others allowed themselves to be hounded from place to place and to be chained in the galleys along with Negroes and Turks. As Stedingers and Waldenses, they fought to the last man for a life true to their own racial essence. They created *all* the foundations of Western-Nordic culture. Without Coligny and Luther there would have been no Bach, no Goethe, no Leibniz, no Kant.

Today a new faith is awakening—the *Mythos* of the blood; the belief that to defend the blood is also to defend the divine nature of man in

general. It is a belief, effulgent with the brightest knowledge, that Nordic blood represents that *Mysterium* which has overcome and replaced the older sacraments.

A review of history from the remotest past to the present day presents the manifold forms of Nordic creative power to our gaze. Aryan India gave the world a metaphysic which has never since been equalled; Aryan Persia constructed for us the religious mythos from which we still draw sustenance; Doric Hellas had a dream of earthly beauty which we see in static perfection never again attained; Italic Rome taught us that formal State discipline with which a threatened community must fashion and defend itself. And Germanic Europe gave to mankind its most radiant ideal. It taught the necessity of *character* as the foundation for all culture and the highest values of the Nordic nature—the concepts of honor and freedom of conscience. This was fought for on battlefields everywhere as well as in the studies of scholars. If it does not triumph in the great struggle which is coming, the West and its blood will perish just as India and Hellas are dissolved forever in chaos.

With the recognition that all that is creative in Europe has been the product of character, we have uncovered the essence of European religion, of Germanic science, and of Nordic art. To become fully conscious of this, to experience it with all the passion of an heroic heart, is to create the basis for every rebirth. It is the foundation of a new world view, of a new-yet-old idea of the State, of the mythos of a new comprehension of life, which alone will give us the strength to throw off the arrogant dominion of the subhumans and to construct a culture in conformity with our own racial character, permeating all facets of existence.

* * *

The purpose of *A Critique Of Pure Reason* is to make us conscious of the formal prerequisites of every possible experience and to limit the multitudinous options of man's activities to specific areas exclusively devoted to them. Ignoring perceptive-critical insights has led in all areas to the greatest relapses into barbarism. Kant's critique of knowledge signified clearly a conscious awakening in an era which had begun to weary of the religious-scholastic, the aridity of naturalism or the oppressiveness of the sensual. With due recognition, however, of the great achievement of Kant's critique of reason, it must be added that nothing was determined beyond the formal concerning the inner nature and the manner of

employment of rational and spiritual powers. An *evalution* of the innermost nature of the various cultures and world views was not attempted. This had been supplied sufficiently by the Roman Catholic system, Jewry, and Islamic fanaticism. In its heart, a people of culture permits no one the right to assess its creations as good and bad, true and false. Cultures are not, in fact, things which descend from the empyrean, for no known reason, as formal culture cycles upon one then another region of the earth. They are full-blooded creations which are each in their own way (rational and irrational) metaphysically rooted, grouped about an intangible center, related to a highest value. All possess, even if later distorted, an element of life-enhancing truth. Every race has its soul and every soul its race—its own unique internal and external architectonic shape, its characteristic form of appearance and demeanor of life style and a unique relationship between its forces of will and reason. Every race cultivates its own highest ideal. If, by the massive infiltration of alien blood and alien ideas this is changed or overthrown, the result of this inner metamorphosis is chaos and by epochs, catastrophe. For a highest value demands a specific nexus of other precepts of life which are subject to it; that is, it determines the style of existence of a race, a people or a group of peoples within a nation. Its elimination therefore involves the dissolution of the entire inner tension necessary for organic creation.

After such catastrophes, it is possible for the spiritual forces to regroup around the old foci and to generate, under new conditions, a new form of being. This can result either from a final victory over those alien values whose intrusion was merely temporary, or by the toleration of a crystalization of a second center alongside the first. A juxtaposition in space and time, however, of two or more world views, each based upon different highest values which are meant to be shared by the same people, is a temporary makeshift which carries within it the seeds of a new collapse. To the extent that the invading ethos succeeds in weakening the original races and peoples and their ideas—even physically undermining them and subjugating them—it signifies the death of a culture soul and its disappearance, even in its external manifestations, from the face of the earth.

The life of a race, of a people, is not a philosophically logical development nor even a process which unfolds in terms of natural law. It is the formation of a mystical synthesis, of an activity of the soul, which cannot be explained by rational deduction nor made intelligible through analyses of cause and effect. Comprehending the inner heart of a culture consists

therefore in elucidating its highest religious, moral, philosophic, scientific, and aesthetic values. These determine its total rhythm and simultaneously, qualify the reciprocal relationship and arrangements of human powers. A people that is primarily religion-oriented will evolve a different sort of culture from that produced by one for which knowledge or beauty prescribe the form of being. *Thus any philosophy which goes beyond formal rational criticism is less a perception than a confession of faith; a* spiritual and racial credo and an avowal of character values.

Our present era of chaos is the product of centuries. Peculiar circumstances have permitted outside forces to intrude upon the Nordic-conditioned people and their laws of life have been thereby weakened. In many places our faith in our own set of ultimate values has been taken from us, or modified as subordinate features of a new system. The race-soul of Northern Europe stood fast in a continuous resistance to these phenomena of decay until, in spite of all, new and hostile centers of power arose. The nineteenth century revealed the existence of three fully developed and contiguous systems throughout Europe. The first was the origininal Nordic West, based on freedom of the soul and the concept of honor; the second was the fully matured Roman system which required humble and submissive love in the service of a centrally-governed priesthood; the third was the naked harbinger of chaos—limitless materialistic individualism with its goal of world dominion by money as a unifying and type-forming force.

These three forces contended, and still contend, for the soul of every European. Even in the last century, men were still summoned to fight for freedom, honor and nationhood. However, 1918 saw the victory of the powers of plutocracy and of the Church of Rome. But even in the midst of the most terrible collapse the old Nordic racial soul awakened to a heightened consciousness. It has finally grasped the truth that the co-existence of different, and perforce mutually exclusive, highest values cannot also co-exist with "equal rights," as, to its present detriment, it once believed possible. It understands that what is racially and spiritually akin can be assimilated, but that which is alien must be unflinchingly excised, or if necessary, destroyed. This is not because it is "false" or "bad" in itself, but rather because it is racially alien and fatal to the inner structure of our being. Our duty today is to see ourselves with the utmost clarity and either to acknowledge our own highest values and the ideas which sustain the Germanic West, or to reject our true nature in body and soul. . .forever.

The real struggle of our times does not so much involve external power displacements and inner compromise (as it did in earlier periods) but rather the re-building of the spiritual cells of the Nordic-conditioned peoples. It concerns the reinstatement to their dominant place of those ideas and values from which everything we understand by culture stems. It concerns the preservation of the racial substance itself. Possibly for a long time to come, the political-power situation will continue to our disadvantage. However, if one day we can visualize and create a new, yet very old, type of German somewhere who, conscious of soul, race and history, unhesitatingly proclaims the old, yet new, values; then around this nucleus will gather all who now stumble in darkness though rooted in the ancient soil of the European homeland.

This is stated at this time in order to acknowledge from the very beginning that there is no intention of promoting that delusion of a "science without hypotheses," such as academic obscurantists have usually done and continue to do in order to lend their opinions the color of universally valid propositions. There is no such a thing as a science without hypotheses. A group of assumptions are made, comprising ideas, theories and hypotheses in order to direct the unorganized powers of inquiry along one course. They are then tested by experiment in order to verify their objective truth. But these presuppositions are just as racially determined as values derived from the will. A unique soul and race confronts the universe with questions of its own unique kind. The questions asked by a Nordic do not appear as problems for Jews or for Chinese. Things which appear as problems to Europeans, seem to other races to be riddles which have already been solved.

At all democratic gatherings today one hears proclaimed the doctrine that art and science are international. The bereft of spirit, whose alienation from life and raceless values brought into disrepute the nineteenth century, can naturally not now be enlightened concerning the limitations of such cosmopolitanism. But a younger generation which is beginning to turn its back on this hothouse creation will discover, after an unbiased study of the variety of this world, that "art for art's sake" does not exist, never has existed, and never will exist. Art is always the creation of a specific blood and the form-linked nature of an art will be only truly comprehensible to those of the same blood. To others it will say little or nothing at all.

Science, however, is also a product of the blood. Everything which we commonly regard today as purely abstract science is the product of Germanic creativity. The Nordic-European concept of organizing sequen-

tial events into a framework of universal laws is not simply some "idea-in-itself" which might have occurred to any Mongol, Levantine or African. Quite the contrary; this idea (which appeared in another form in Nordic Hellas) was confronted for thousands of years by the most frenetic hostility of the many alien races and their world views. The idea of an inward and personal law was the deepest affront to every world picture constructed on the basis of the capricious tyranny of various systems of magic. A science of our kind could as little emerge from the world picture offered in the Old Testament as it could from the witchcraft and demonology of the African. It is this eternal antithesis which explains the struggle of the Roman Church against Germanic science. And the latter has pursued its brilliant course through streams of its own blood, shed by Rome. Devout Nordic monks who dared to lay more value on the evidence of their own senses than on yellowed Syrian parchments, were met with poison, imprisonment and the knife, as in the cases of Roger Bacon or Scotus Erigena. This Germanic racial creation which we call science is not mere technology. It is the product of a unique method of posing questions to the universe. As Apollo faces Dionysus, so Copernicus, Kant and Goethe stand opposed to Augustine, Boniface VIII and Pius IX. The Maenads and the phallic cults worked to the destruction of ancient Greek culture, and the Etruscan ideas of hell and wizardry blocked in every way they could the rebirth of a Nordic world vision. In the story of how Jesus drove the devils out of the swine, Syrian magic fastened itself onto Christianity even to the present day. Descent to hell and ascent to heaven, the fires and torments of the pit, became the wisdom thereafter of Christian theology. The succubi and incubi became firmly established doctrine. It was not surprising that only in 1827 did Rome finally remove from the *Index* those books which acknowledged Copernicus' heliocentric theory. For, according to Roman "truth," only its own doctrine is true science. It was forced to accept—with much gnashing of teeth—that after two thousand years and all the blood it had shed it could no longer enforce this particular doctrine [of Ptolemaic astronomy. *Ed.*], but it still continues to debauch the Nordic spirit of inquiry with concepts which are essentially magical in nature. The clearest example of this is the Jesuit Order with its "scientific departments." The Jesuit Cathrein has declared: "When once a truth is firmly fixed by faith" (Rome deciding the meaning of "firmly fixed"), then every contradictory assertion is false and can therefore never be the product of true science." Dr. J. Donat, the modern theoretician of Jesuit "science," says that *any* doubt concerning religious truths is inadmissible. "Things go sadly with a science," he

proclaims, "which has nothing to offer but endless searching after truth." The profound dichotomy in spiritual attitudes could not be more clearly evident than in these words of an Alpine man who is completely immersed in Levantine-Syrian demonry. They signify nothing less than a demand for the total subordination of the Germanic-European spirit of inquiry to an arbitrary dogma.

The modern "science" of economics is yet another example of subverting the recognition of inner law by introducing arbitrary speculation. The European researcher, as soon as he tries to utilize a discovery in a practical way, nevertheless always aims at a genuine achievement which he wishes to see incorporated into the system of cause and effect, motive and result, as something produced and created. He sees work, inventions and possessions as socially formative forces within a racial, national or political community. Even Americans like Edison and Ford have endorsed this spiritual attitude. Even the stock market was originally intended only as a device to make smooth the transition from creation to consequence and between invention, product and sale. It was an expedient just like money itself. Now, quite another function has developed from this originally useful service. The stock market and the "science" of finance presently play with fictions. They are a magical legerdemain with figures and a systematic distortion effected by certain circles in the transition from production to marketing. The masters of the modern stock market use mass hypnosis and doctored news to create panics. They deliberately inflame every pathological impulse so that from a healthy activity of exchange in economic life there have developed caprice and universal dissolution. This "financial science" is not even "international"; it is simply Jewish. Economic disruption among the Nordic peoples comes from their attempt to fit into their system of life this unnatural Levantine manipulation which is based on purely parasitic instincts. This process, if finally successful, will bring utter destruction to all the natural prerequisites of our life. The "science" of the *Dawes Plan* and the supervision exercised by the bankers and their controlled press over the reporting of political news, is thoroughly anti-German. Thus it stands in deadly enmity against the Nordic economic system and its great German philosophers—men like Adam Muller, Adolf Wagner, and Friedrich Lizt. In this, too, the nature of Jewish Marxism manifests itself. It fights "capitalism" but leaves untouched the heart of capitalism; stock-market finance.

The prerequisite of Romish "science" is compulsory belief in arbitrary church law; the prerequisite of Jewish "science" is fiction, or more

precisely, humbug; the prerequisite of Germanic science is the recognition of universal laws and the human soul which manifest themselves in various effects. Such perceptions are fundamental to the understanding of the totality of life, and even to those phenomena such as clairvoyance and somnabulism which, as yet, cannot be wholly integrated into this *schema*.

And this means everything. When today we speak of realizations and acknowledgements, we always start from certain prerequisite assumptions. We examine the various highest values which contend for the souls of all Europeans. We establish the existing architectonics of the forces relating to these highest values and then we accept one of these systems as a belief. A general acknowledgement and acceptance of such a belief. can only come from similar and related, but hitherto blinded, souls. Others will, and must, reject it. If they cannot suppress it, then they must dispute it in every possible way.

Such a liberation and release of both the individual and the whole people from the still powerful influences of a dying past is painful and must cause many deep wounds. But we have only one choice; to go under or to take up the fight for a recovery. To begin this fight with clear understanding and an iron will is the task of our generation. Its final consummation is the concern of the future.

* * *

To primitive man, the world appears as a succession without causality of images in space and sensations in time. Subsequently, the mind creates causal connections and reason establishes unity in diversity by laying down intellectual parameters. The network of these activities we call our experience. Such is the formal basis for all life. However, the latter is employed in basically different ways. An overpreponderance of reason in the formulation of ideas will lead to the various unities being restricted to fewer and fewer comprehensive schemes. The ultimate end of this is a single principle of explanation of the world. This formal monism expresses itself in different ways according to whether one wishes to interpret the world in terms of matter or in terms of force. The logical mechanist accepts molecules, atoms and electrons as primal substances whose diversity of forms and manifold combinations create spirit and soul. The logical energeticist recognizes in matter only a concentrated form of latent energy which can discharage itself as electricity, light or heat. Both the materialist and the spiritualist monists are dogmatists because

they put aside the last seemingly formal, as well as the seemingly material, primal phenomenon of the world with a single assertion which decides all questions. This is either a philosophic-scientific principle or a religious belief. This primal phenomenon, after rejecting multiple pluralism, is the polarity of all phenomena and of all ideation. Polarity shows itself in light and shadow, hot and cold, finite and infinite. Spiritually, it shows itself as true and untrue; morally as good and evil (a dichotomy which can only be disputed in relation to concrete examples); dynamically as motion and rest; as positive and negative; in religion as divine and satanic. Polarity always manifests itself in the simultaneity of opposites, not as chronologically alternating with one another. The concept of "good" is incomprehensible without that of "evil" and only receives its delimitation by it. Negative electricity always appears simultaneously with positive. Both forms are, in fact, positive—only with their signs reversed. "No" postulates "Yes." The idea of the spiritual appears together with the idea of the corporeal. Nor are they to be interpreted as merely alternating with one another chronologically.

All life, however, arises from the continuous antithesis of Yea and Nay. Everything creative—even the dogmatic monist, whether materialistic or spiritualistic—exists only by reason of the persistence of eternal conflict. Only in the mirror of the body does the spiritualist perceive the spirit; only with the presupposition of differing qualities can the materialist deal with variations in form and changes in substance.

Self and Universe, therefore, confront one another as two ultimate polarities, and the emphasis which the soul lays upon one or the other (subconsciously recognizing their antithesis) determines the nature, complexion and rhythm of its interpretation of the world and of life. From this primal metaphysical law of Being and Becoming polarities which are experientially mutually exclusive at any given instant) there ensue two kinds of life feeling—the dynamic and the static creation of values.

A predominantly static world-view will tend to some kind of monism. It will endeavor to establish a single spiritual synthesis, a single symbol, indeed, a single form of life against every polarity, plurality or multiplicity. In religion, it will insist on a strict monotheism. It will invest this unique god with all features of strength and significance, attributing to him all creation. It will even endeavor to explain away the satanic. Jehovah evolved into this kind of god and then, with the aid of the Christian Church, broke into Western thought as a rigid and narrow system.

Originally, the Hebrews and Jews had been involved in an entirely

pluralistic theology. To be sure, their tribal god looked after their interests and they after his, but none doubted that other gods [of other peoples] were just as real and effective as Jehovah. It was under the Persian empire that the Jews first learned of a universal, cosmic God, Ahura Mazda (the God of Light) and of his enemy, dark Ahriman. They were later taken over as a universal despot—Jehovah—and his rival, Satan. The Jew gradually rid himself of all pluralisms, placing Shaddai-Jehovah at the center of all things with himself as his authorized servant. Thus he created a focal point for himself and this has preserved and bred his thinking, his race and his type—even if purely parasitic—up to the present day and despite any marginal race-mixing. Even when recreant Jews abjured Jehovah, they only put in his place what was essentially the same concept under other names. This they called "humanism," "liberty," "liberalism," "class." From these there reemerged the same old rigid Jehovah, breeding his offspring under a variety of designations. Since Jehovah is conceived as being materially effective, the rigid Jewish insistence upon one single God is interwoven with practical material concerns—that is, materialism—and the most sterile philosophical superstition, for which the Old Testament, the Talmud and Karl Marx represent closely related visions. This static self-assertion is the metaphysical ground for the strength and tenacity of the Jew, as well as for his cultural sterility and parasitism.

The same static instinct is the central core of the Roman Church. It sets up a synthesis, with itself as the successor of the displaced "God's chosen people" and develops the same rigidity and formalism as Judaism and as the later, also Semitic, Mohammedanism, Such systems recognize only "the law," which is to say, arbitrary fiats. They never acknowledge personality. When such a system gains power it necessarily destroys the organic. It is only thanks to the fact that the system could not attain complete triumph that there still exist peoples and cultures—in short, real life.

The reaction in Europe against the crippling weight of the Church was powerful enough to force a lasting spiritual pluralism into the Jewish-Roman theology. Thus one can quite justifiably speak of Catholicism and its saints as a polytheistic belief. By Catholicism we mean, of course, the religious phenomenon, not the political entity. But in spite of this development, the centralized authority of the churches strengthened a static and monistic outlook in Europe and, by way of the attached New Testament, smuggled the spirit of the Old Testament into a Protestantism which was originally individualistic.

From the outset, Protestanism was spiritually divided. Seen as a defensive reaction, it signified the upsurge of the Germanic will to freedom, to a national life, and to the primacy of the individual conscience. Without question, it blazed a path for all that today we regard as our greatest works of culture and science. Religiously, however, it failed. It stopped half way. It substituted for Rome a Semitic Jerusalem as its center. The sovereign authority managed to block the emergence of that spirit which had been preached by Meister Eckhart but which could not prevail against the Inquistion and the stake. So it was that, when Luther at Worms laid his hand simultaneously on both the Old and the New Testaments, he performed an act which his followers deemed symbolic and holy. The faith and the values of Protestants were now to be determined by these books. The standards of our spiritual life again lay outside what is German, even though no longer in a strictly geographical sense as had been the case with Rome and the "Antichrist." Luther's encounter with Zwingli showed how much he was still bound by the old chains. Luther's material-oriented communion doctrine has been a millstone around the Protestant creed up to the present day. Much later, Luther did cast aside "the Jews and their lies," and declare that he no longer had anything to do with Moses. But by then the Bible had become a popular work and the prophecies of the Old Testament integral to religion. As a result, the judaisation and torpidity of our life were pushed a step further and it is no wonder that thenceforth blond German children were forced every Sunday to sing: "To Thee, to Thee, O Jehovah, will I sing; for where is such a God as Thee. . .?"

The Jews had borrowed (as with so much else) the idea of a universal God from the Persians. In this lies the most telling evidence for the religious-philosophical recognition of the polarity of Being. The great cosmic struggle between light and darkness endures throughout many world epochs until, after the climactic battle, there comes the world savior, the *Caoshiane*, to separate the sheep from the goats. This represents the same figure as did Jesus in later times. The drama must naturally reach its climax with victory, but nowhere is the spiritual dynamic portrayed more consciously and more splendidly than in the ancient Persian writings. Today, as we begin to slough off the alien and static influence of all that smacks of Jerusalem, the Persian drama appears to us as primordial and closely related to the sagas of the Nordic peoples. The metaphysical conception is conjoined with a stern moral code and thus fortifies the spiritual community in religion and morality.

When he first appears on the stage of history, the German is not of a philosophical bent. But if anything is characteristic of his nature, then it is an aversion to all kinds of monism and a distaste for the kind of ecclesiastical rigidity which was forced upon him by Rome's technical and diplomatic superiority at a time of weakness. It was a time when the pristine youth of the German race was ending and the old gods were dying while new ones were being sought.

If the struggle between Europe and Rome ended in a compromise which, for all the upheavals, has endured for over 1500 years, nonetheless this compromise has proved impossible in the realms of art, philosophy and science. It is precisely in these areas that the struggle has been most consciously and tenaciously pursued, and it has ended with the defeat of the menace of the *Index* and the terror of the stake. This is true even if the fact has not yet permeated the sluggish minds of the masses or, indeed, those of the superficially educated. In this the entire dynamic of the European spirit stands revealed, together with its clear, analytical grasp of the polarity of Being. Yet, at the same time, it shows that a battle for form has stirred the North European less than the inward character value of truthfulness as the prerequisite for science and philosophy.

Consciously or unconsciously, the Nordic spirit distinguishes between two worlds—the world of freedom and the world of nature. With Immanuel Kant, this ancient determinant of our life-thought was brought to the fullest level of conscious apprehension and can never thereafter be lost to our understanding. But this awakening involved a quite unique view of reality. The late Indian dissolved the entire universe into symbolism. The self became ultimately only an indication of an eternal Oneness. For the Indian metaphysician, "reality" was not a describable fact which could be fitted into the chain of cause and effect or action and consequence, as is the way with our thinking. For him it was a purely subjective postulation in relation to an event or a narrative. Thus the Indian does not demand belief in the fabulous deeds of Rama or Krishna as actual events. For him they become "real" insofar as they are believed. On the basis of this interpretation of reality, girls transform themselves into flowers in the Indian theatre, their arms change into liana vines. Gods appear in a variety of quasi-human shapes. Since it is dependent on belief as symbolism, the "miracle" is divested of its material significance.

It is otherwise for the peoples of the eastern Mediterranean. There, freedom was injected into nature through magic, and the history of those lands is packed with "real" miracles which are believed to be literal events. A clear example of the consciousness that he was ruling two

different worlds is given to us by the Emperor Hadrian. In the Germanic Northwest of the empire, he was an heroic servant of the State, enduring all the rigors of travel as a simple soldier. He was lord and ruler but not god and miracle worker. But it was precisely as the latter that this clever judge of men allowed himself to be portrayed during his travels through the African, Levantine and Hellenistic regions. Thus he was worshipped in the south and southeast of the empire as a savior and was accepted as the director of the Eleusian mysteries. He blandly permitted himself to be worshipped as Helios. In Egypt, he introduced Antigonus as a god, whose death and resurrection was taught by the priests and as truly believed at the time as the death and "real" resurrection of Jesus. Hadrian healed the sick and made cripples whole by the laying on of hands. Stories about his miraculous deeds spread through all the lands of the eastern Mediterranean as an indisputable chronicle. In a similar way, the Christian legends are also derived from the superstitions about magic which are characteristic of certain peoples. They are still today solemly proclaimed to Europeans. There is the doctrine of the "virgin birth," the various transfigurations of the Catholic saints to whom the Virgin Mary appeared, or the report by the Jesuit Mansonius that Jesus appeared in the flesh to the virgin Joanna of Alexandria on June 7, 1598, and expressed his gratification with the work of "His" Society.

Evidence of just how greatly this magical world of Asia-Africa had oppressed Europe and threatened to suffocate all thought, even of the freest, is shown in Luther's verdict upon Copernicus whom he called a swindler and a cheat just because the magical Bible said that things were otherwise than as Copernicus taught. Even today, millions have not yet fully grasped that Copernicus, by replacing the static world-picture of the motionless earth disc and heaven above and hell below with the dynamism of an eternally revolving solar system, put paid once and for all to the Church doctrine of blind belief as well as the entire mythology of hell and resurrection. The Nicene Creed which was decided by a majority of the quarreling priests at the command of the Roman emperor, the dogmas which were formulated at synods where religious questions were settled with vicious brawling and with cudgels, are inwardly false and dead. Nothing reveals more clearly the futility and falseness of our churches than that they prate of things which have nothing to do with religion and that they still defend doctrines in which they no longer believe. They are entirely correct when they argue that if the Old Testament or the Nicene Creed were pried out of the structure of the Church the corner stones would be lacking and the whole building would collapse. True enough!

But the collapse has never been prevented for more than a few decades by a threadbare pretence of expediency. And the later the collapse came, the more terrible it would be. Gods who are no longer believed in become mere idols. When life becomes a matter of empty forms, spiritual death or revolution is imminent. There are no alternatives.

"I am come not to bring peace but a sword," said the rebel from Nazareth, and "I will light a fire on the earth and I would that it burned already." His life was one revelation, but the priests, concerned with preserving their authority, announced that this revelation happened only once in history and supported this claim with ingeniously "fulfilled" prophecies and allusions to the future, and made strenuous efforts to turn life into death.

* * *

It is of the nature of the static ideal that it demands "rest." But this denial of all the dynamic demands of life cannot be realized in the face of the eternal flux of nature. It turns therefore to the non-temporal concepts. These are "revelations" which are proclaimed as long as possible as that which *is*, as "eternal truth." He who is aware of the dynamic, on the other hand, while consciously or unconsciously acknowledging Being, concerns himself with Becoming as the expression of Being and he does not consider magical or spurious revelations as essential to his spiritual experience. This permanent condition of Becoming as a struggle for Being is the Germanic religion which still asserts itself even in the midst of the most world-rejecting mysticism. "Revelation" to the Nordic can only be a heightening and crowning of the process of Becoming, not a destruction of natural law. But the Jewish concept of God, alike with the Romanist, wills the latter. The severest blow is given to that outlook by Germanic science and Nordic art. The Jehovah of the Church is as moribund as Wotan was 1500 years ago. The Nordic spirit gained philosophical consciousness in Immanuel Kant whose fundamental achievement lies in the separation he established between forces of religion and science. Religion is concerned with "the kingdom of heaven within us," true science only with physics, chemistry, biology and mechanics. This distinction is critical as a precondition for a Nordic culture true to its own intrinsic nature. It signifies the overthrow of the Syrian-Jewish-inspired dogmas and the freeing of our dynamic polarity as freedom-mysticism and nature-mechanics. This alone assures true unity. The historical task of the movement of national renewal which now arises in Germany is to

strengthen the foundations of our culture, despite their subsequent perversion by Roman-Jewish doctrines and Syrian-African world views, and to assist in the victory of Nordic values.

All these racial-psychological and perception-critical considerations and historical references display a great multiplicity of the forces of race-soul or race-chaos struggling with each other for predominance. But they show also a certain consistency in the conduct of the Nordic or mainly Nordic-conditioned elements. All the gods of the Indo-Europeans are gods of the heavens, of light and of day. The Indian Varuna, the Greek Uranus, Zeus, Father of the Gods, and Odin, god of the heavens, Surya (the "Radiant One") of the Indians, Apollo-Helios and Ahura Mazda—they all share the same essence at the same characteristic stage of development. In this religion of light, the patriarchal principle confronted the various chthonic-matriarchal oriented racial elements.

At another level, mythology is permeated with the heroic and linked with the enquiring spirit and the yearning for knowledge. In this way the gods became the representatives of various impulses of will and spirit. The sun god of the ancient Indians was prayed to in the early morning not only for fertility but also for wisdom, while Odin sacrificed one of his eyes in the quest of knowledge. At the high point of philosophical problem-solving, we find the Upanishads, Plato and Kant who, in spite of profound differences of approach, arrive at identical answers concerning the ideality of space, time and causality.

It was thus perceived that diversity did not mean chaos nor a perceived unity mean merely an amorphous sameness. This was extremely important because it places us not only in the sharpest opposition to all absolutist and universalist systems (which on the supposition of an ostensible "humanity" seek to establish a unitarianism of all souls for all time) but also brings us into conflict with genuinely new forces of our own time which have likewise buried their dead and with whom we often have sympathetic contact. yet such forces, in justifiable defense against a vile, sterile and suffocating rationalism, now seek refuge in a return to the "primal depths" and declare war on the spirit as such in order to find their way back to a unity of body and soul which lumps together under "spirit" all reason, intellect and will.

One is immediately reminded of the sentimental "return to nature" and the glorification of the primitive which appeared in the late eighteenth century. But this view is far too moderate and reasonable when confronted with the assertions of people such as Ludwig Klages or Melchior Palagyi. What depth psychology and character study is striving for lies

much deeper. Its demands, in fact, call for a basis in a race-soul in order to provide an organic substructure for the whole concept.

The emergence of a sharply defined consciousness must be seen to have constituted the first alienation of the heroic primitive man from his creative, natural state with its feeling of awe and reverence. This natural state is represented as *alone* being true life and as having been corrupted by purely rational ideas and concepts. At once we see how closely yet how totally our racial-spiritual world view and the new psycho-cosmogony confront one another. This intellect is, as it is propounded, only a formal tool, and is thus devoid of content. Its task is simply to establish the sequence of causality. However, once it is enthroned as a legislating sovereign it signifies the end of a culture, and as a proof—overlooked by the Vitalists—of racial poisoning. Up to this point there is much agreement. However, it is quite unnecessary that reason and purpose be inimical to spirit. We have seen how, in contrast to peoples of the Semitic type, the attitudes of soul, will and reason of the Nordics toward the universe were essentially in harmony. We are not, therefore, concerned with the abstraction of "primitive man" to whom one might justifiably assign a "confidence in wordly existence" but with a clearly defined racial character. The curious fact emerges that the most embittered enemies of modern anti-life rationalism have themselves created an unconsciously creative and heroic primitive man—as far as we can pletely rational way. But the nature of primitve man—as far as we can reasonably conjecture—was not particularly heroic. Jewish legends begin with stories about cattle raising, not of heroic deeds. The biblical account of the exodus of the Jews from Egypt is accompanied by the tale of all the treasures which they had stolen from the Egyptians. Even among themselves, their swindling and parasitic behavior in the "promised land" is the antithesis of the heroic. Genuine heroism is also lacking among the Pheonicians in spite of their lengthy voyanges conducted along the sea coasts. And the pure Semite—the Arab for example—though he is capable of courage and ferocity, is almost wholly uncreative. The Etruscans, to be sure, have left a record of obscene practices and monuments, but nothing which would permit us to assume any creative spiritual faculties.

On the other hand, heroism is basic to the character of the Nordic peoples. This heroism of the ancient mythic period—and this is what is decisive—has never been lost, despite reverses of fortune, so long as the Nordic blood was still alive. Heroism, in fact, took many forms, from the warrior nobility of Siegfried or Hercules to the intellectual nobility of Copernicus and Leonardo, the religious nobility of Eckhart and Lagarde,

or the political nobility of Frederick the Great and Bismarck, and its substance has remained the same.

The universal character which has been postulated as existing in antiquity is a fallacious modern abstraction. Even after the conclusion of the age of "natural instinct," the reason and the will are not divorced from the living blood unless they are strangled in the spiritual jungle of the Near East. Things are not as the new body-soul doctrine seeks to represent; namely, that only the earthbound man of instinct is close to nature, more of an integrated being and more vital, while what is spiritual belongs to another sphere. Again, it is not true that the chthonic idea which (stimulated by the intoxicated poetic imaginings of Bachofen) inspires this new doctrine testifies to a greater profundity of life and certainty of existence. The peoples who began with the sun and light mythos and developed it further are consequently linked to the visible creator and protector of everything organic. Only from the sun-impregnated soil arise Aphrodite and Demeter, Isis and Astarte.

The sun myth of the Aryan is not only transcendental but also a universal law of nature and biology. To reject it on behalf of "universality of instinct" and even with yearning glances toward the Near East, is a regression into spiritual and racial chaos, very similar to the unwholesome conditions of late Rome. Much as our modern characterology and doctrine of body-soul unity may differ from the naive naturalism of a Rousseau or Tolstoy, two things are common to both schools—a cultural pessimism and a touching belief in a world certainty and of man still unspoiled by intellection. The refined life style and the "athletics" of spiritual equilbrium of the great Encyclopaedists of the Enlightenment created a spiritual aridity and called forth an inward and then an outward resistance to all previous religious and social principles. *Die Rauber, Faust, Gretchen*, are all manifestations of the *Sturm und Drang* against restrictions and bonds under the banner of what was new, personal and individualistic. This abandonment by the Self of its natural, primal roots led either to catastrophe—from Werther's Idyll to Werther's Sorrows—or to a recognition of the ambiguities of a Nature conceived of as so "natural." In place of cultural pessimism there arose scepticism about a blissful "return to nature." And this ultimate phase will not be spared the Neo-Vitalists who declare war on the entire present-day culture (as well as the culture of tomorrow) in the name of a purely abstract (this is important to note) Nature mystique. This movement will only prove fruitful when, from the monolithic concept of "universal" Nature, it releases the organic forms and the races, and recognizes their individual

life-rhythms, studies the conditions which have stimulated creativity and the conditions under which decay or diminution of the driving spiritual impetus begins. Then the new, naturalistic Romanticism will be compelled to take leave of abstract universalism as a reaction to unbridled rationalistic individualism and also to renounce its basic hostility to the will and the reason.

A deep gulf yawns open between this vegetative vitalism and the essence of consciousness, but the resulting tension is the prerequisite of all creativity. That such a gulf exists is a result of the fact that our whole vegetative-animal existence is lived as a continuous stream while our conscious perception is intermittent. It is due to these discrete perceptions and to the establishment of categories of time and patterns of events that language, art and science are made possible. On the other hand, herein lies the deepest justification for Kant's argument that idea and experience never completely coincide, that is to say, a culture constructed only upon conscious thought can never be entirely "vital." These two realms are thus fundamental to our dual nature. Accordingly, the triumphs of individual genius in all areas are an artistic amalgam of freedom and nature; and the accomplishments of entire peoples represent the half agonized, half rapturous, symbols of the conquest of the unconquerable. National cultures are the great spiritual pulses in the eternal ebb and flow of dying and becoming. Since Nordic man arises from this evolving life and from the light of day, he is by nature a vitalist. But the greatest achievement of his whole history was the Germanic recognition that nature was not to be mastered by magic (as the Near East had believed) or by intellectual schemata (as the later Greeks thought) but only by the most conscientious study of nature. In this respect, the devout Albertus Magnus (Albrecht von Bollstedt) approaches Goethe, and the visionary Francis of Assisi comes close to the religious skeptic Leonardo. The Germanic West has not allowed itself to be robbed of this kind of vitalism by the Church of Rome in spite of excommunication, poison and the stake. And this vitalism was both cosmic and, at the same time, conversely. Because Germanic man felt in a cosmic-solar way, it enabled him to discover the rule of natural law upon the earth. Perhaps it was precisely this very profound feeling which enabled him to shape the patterns of science and to evolve symbolic ideas which alone afforded him the tools, despite the intermittence of continually formative consciousness, to approach so closely to the eternal flux.

That one school today idolizes these symbols and patterns signifies an identical condition of decadence as does the idolization of vitalism in

itself. Germanic science did not arise amid the martyrdom of nine million "heretics" as if the greatest allegory of inward freedom is either to be condemned along with its essential components and methods or to be idolatrously worshipped. Those who today rage against technology and heap maledictions upon it forget that its appearance derives from an eternal German impulse which would have to be destroyed along with it. Truly, this would mean a descent into the same barbarism which was the ultimate fate of the Mediterranean cultures. It is not technology which today destroys vitality. It is man himself who has degenerated. He has become inwardly deformed because, at weak moments in his historical experience, alien seductions were dangled before him—world conversion, humanity, universal culture. Today, it is necessary to break the hypnotic spell and not deepen the sleep of our generation nor to preach the irreversibility of fate, but to assert those values of the blood which, once understood, can give a new direction to the younger generation and make possible a renaissance of culture and breeding. From a clear understanding of the nature of the past struggles of the organically determined Indo-European peoples against alien forces and after comprehending the development of our own natural life and our characteristic attitudes to the universe, we feel and understand the longing of our generation to reject the transitory "present day" and recognize an eternal *now*. Thus we can bring reason and will into harmony with our Germanic current of soul and spirit; indeed, if possible, with that true Nordic tradition handed down to us from Hellas and ancient Rome. Philosophically, this means to give the aberrant modern will a noble motivation in accordance with its primal nature.

In heroic conduct, whether of warriors, philosophers or scientists, we see what is of essential nature, and we know that all heroism groups itself around a supreme value. This has always been the idea of honor, spiritual and mental. But the idea of honor, like its corporeal representatives, was and is involved in a war of soul and spirit against the values represented by alien races or the miscegenated offspring of racial chaos.

II. Love and Honor

Many wars during the last 1900 years have borne the stamp of wars of religion. In most cases justifiedly, yet not always so. The very fact that struggles of extermination could be carried out at all for a religious conviction shows to what degree the Teutonic peoples had been successfully alienated from their original character. Respect for religious belief was just as natural to the pagan Teutons as to the later Aryans; only the assertion of the claim by the Roman Church that it alone offered salvation hardened the European heart and necessarily called forth defensive struggles in the opposing camp which, since likewise conducted for an alien-natured form, resulted in spiritual narrowmindedness (Lutheranism, Calvinism, Puritanism).

But in spite of everything, most of the struggles by leading heroes of our history were conducted less for theological principles of belief about Jesus, Mary, the nature of the Holy Ghost, Purgatory etc., than for character values. The churches of all denominations declared: as the faith, so the man. This was necessary for every church and promised success, since in this way the value of a man was made dependent on its coercive principles and men were thus spiritually enchained to the chosen church organization. On the other hand the Nordic-European creed—whether consciously or unconsciously—has always been: as the man, so his belief. More exactly put, as the nature or content of his belief. If the

belief protected the highest values of character, then it was real and good, irrespective of what expressions of human longing might otherwise have surrounded it. If it did not do so, if it repressed proud personal values then it must have been felt in the deepest innermost heart of every Teuton as bringing destruction. There are two values above all others, in which for nearly two thousand years the whole opposition between Church and race, theology and belief, coercive doctrine and pride of character are revealed; two values rooted in will, for which in Europe there has always been a struggle for predominance: love and honor. Both accordingly strove for recognition as highest values; the churches wished—however strange this may sound—to rule through love, the Nordic Europeans wished to live free through honor or to die free in honor. Both ideas found martyrs ready for sacrifice but this conflict did not always attain the clearest consciousness, however often it revealed itself.

This recognition has persisted into our own days. It is a mythic experience but nevertheless as clear as daylight. Love and sympathy, honor and duty are spiritual essences which, enveloped by different outward forms, represent driving forces of life for almost all races and nations capable of culture. Depending upon what room was made for love in its most general version or the concept of honor as such, the world outlook and form of the people in question developed in a manner corresponding to this desired goal. One or the other idea formed the yardstick by which the whole of thought and action were measured. But in order to create a determinative characteristic for an epoch, one or other ideal must predominate. The conflict between two ideas can nowhere be followed more tragically than in the disputes between the Nordic race and its allies with the particular racial and ideological environment.

With regard to what motive has above all proven itself as formative for the Nordic race in affairs of soul, State and culture, it is evident that almost everything which has preserved the character of our race, our peoples and nations, has been in the first place the concept of honor and the idea of duty inseparably connected with it, originating from the consciousness of inward freedom. But from the moment at which love and sympathy (or if one wishes: fellow-feeling) became predominant, began the epochs of racial-national and cultural dissolution in the history of all once Nordic-determined States.

Today, Hinduism and Buddhism are preached to the point of superfluity. The majority of us possess no other idea of India than as it is presented to us by theosophists and anthroposophists. We speak of India as having a soft-hearted philosophy of life merging with the universe,

with human love as its highest teaching. Undoubtedly, the late philosophy flowing into infinity, the Vedanta-Atman-Brahman doctrine, Buddhism striving for redemption from the sufferings of this world, along with thousands of proverbs scattered throughout the whole of Indian literature, justify this interpretation: "Nothing exists which cannot be accomplished by gentleness." "Happy are those who withdraw into the forest after they have fulfilled the hope of the needy, have shown love for their enemies," etc. And yet into these love and sympathy-filled products of the late Indian period quite different, older views, intrude which do not recognize personal feelings of happiness and absence of sorrow as the only goal worth striving for but see the latter in the fulfilment of duty and the assertion of honor. In one of the oldest Indian poems duty is even praised as a "sixth inner sense." In the Mahabaratam the entire struggle revolves (in its original form) around this idea. Fima the hero who only unwillingly participates in war, says he would abandon his ruler, "if my Lord did not bind me with the bond of duty of a Chatya, so that I may even strike down without mercy my dear grandsons with its darts."

Karna the Strong says:

> Honor, like a mother, provides
> Men with life in the world,
> Dishonor consumes life,
> Even if the body's well-being prospers.

King Durjozana's downfall is brought about in spite of all the laws of war and he laments:

> Are you not ashamed, that Fimasen
> Has dishonorably defeated me?
> We have fought honorably enough,
> And honor remains to us in defeat.
> You have always fought dishonorably
> And bear your victory with disgrace.
> But I have ruled the earth,
> As far as the sea's distant shore,
> Have stood courageously before the foe
> And die now, as a hero
> Wishes to die, in service of duty,
> And rise up to the Gods accompanied by
> A host of friends. . .

These are certainly completely different tones to the ones we generally find in the more familiar poems. But these and a hundred other passages

from Indian literature, prove that the ancient Indian—and it was he who created India—did not abandon his life for love, but for the sake of duty and honor. A faithless man was also condemned in Aryan India, not because he was loveless but because he had become without honor. "Better to give up life, than to lose honor: the giving of life one feels only for a moment, but the loss of honor day by day," says a folk proverb. "It seems to the heart of a hero, as if a purpose is attained by heroic behavior, to a coward as if this can be attained by cowardice," affirms another proverb and sets up a value. A keen eye will discern these features of ancient Indian nature which can be found until the time of the brave king Poros who, defeated by Alexander in honorable battle on the field, nevertheless remains a complete knight. Although wounded, he still did not flee the field when others ran away. "How shall I deal with you?" asked Alexander of his defeated foe. "In a kingly way," was the answer. "Nothing more?" asked the Macedonian. "In the word kingly lies everything," ran Poros's answer. So Alexander enlarged the extent of Poros's rule, who from then on was a true friend to him. Whether this tale be historically true is irrelevant. But it shows the inward standard of honor, loyalty, duty and bravery, which was common to both heroes and clear, indeed self-evident, to the historian also.

The ancient Indian kingdom kept to this manly concept of honor and made the prerequisite of its social structure. But when this concept of honor was replaced by ritual religious-philosophical systems denying all earthly limitations, coupled with racial decomposition, religious and dogmatic, then economic, viewpoints appeared authoritative. With the philosophy of Atman-Brahman transferred to earthly life—as elaborated earlier—the Aryan denied his race, hence his personality, but as a result also the idea of honor as forming the spiritual backbone of his life.

Love and sympathy—even when they claim to comprise "the entire world,"—nevertheless always direct themselves at the individual loving or suffering creature. But the wish to liberate others or oneself from suffering, is a purely personal feeling which contains no really strong racial or State-forming element. The love of what is nearest or what is farthest can produce deeds of supreme self-sacrifice but this is nevertheless a spiritual power related to the individual and no man has ever in seriousness demanded the sacrifice of an entire State, of an entire people for the sake of a love unrelated to the latter. And nowhere has an army yet sacrificed itself for this.

Athenian life appears to us as fundamentally milder than the ancient Indian. Admittedly, in Greece an heroic epic also speaks of heroic deeds;

but these have more of an aesthetic foundation. (More concerning this in the Second Book). However, the three hundred Spartans of Thermopyle are regarded by us as a parable for honor and fulfilment of duty. Nothing gives better proof of the influence of the latter than our attempts at a restoration of Greek life. We were unable to conceive things otherwise than that all Hellenes were impelled by honor and duty; only very recently have we been able to convince ourselves of the weakness of Greek life in this respect. The Greek, with his gift for fantasy, in fact did not lay great value upon his word in normal life, he scarcely recognized the sober legal value of an assertion. Here we discover the most vulnerable part of the Greek character, the trapdoor, so to speak, by which the deceitful Hither-Asiatic trader entered, so that lies and falsehood later formed the constant background of "Greek" life which occasioned Lysander to the words that one cheats children with dice, men with oaths. But in spite of this the real Greek was pervaded by a feeling of freedom which one must describe as rooted throughout in consciousness of honor. The killing of wives and the suicide of men defeated in a battle is no rare occurrence. "Do not give yourself into slavery, as long as it still remains open to you to die freely," teaches Euripides. The remembrance of the deed by the Phocians who before the battle surrounded those of their people left behind with a wooden wall, with the advice to set fire to this in case of defeat, remains heroic evidence, of strong symbolic power. The descendants of Zakynthos preferred to die in the flames rather than to fall into the hands of the Punics. In even later times (BC 200) evidence of mythic heroism is provided, for example, in the case of Abydos which, besieged by Philip the Younger, does not surrender but whose men stab their wives and children, throw themselves from the walls and destroy the city through fire. The same valuing of life, of freedom and honor also passes through ancient womanhood, whenever it was necessary to protect the latter from violation. Thus Eurydice, influenced by her mother, hanged herself; with the overpowering of the ruler of Elis in the 3rd century the latter's wife hanged herself with her two daughters.

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that the static nature of Greek life was conditioned not by character but by beauty which as mentioned, had political irresponsibility as a fatal consequence.

Through Alexander, a more disciplined idea of late Greek life, primarily aesthetic, once again predominated and which was also conscious of racial differences. Alexander did not unconditionally pursue the aim of a world monarchy and the mixing of peoples, but wished only to unite the Persians and Greeks, recognized as racial kindred, and to bring them

under one rule, so as to avoid further wars. He recognized the driving ideas and character values of the Persian upper stratum as being related to his own Macedonian idea of duty; for this reason he therefore only placed Macedonians or Persians in leading posts, whereas Semites, Babylonians and Syrians were deliberately excluded. After Alexander's death his successors made efforts to emulate his type of State in their lands and provinces. Like a hero from primeval times stands out one-eyed Antigonus who at the age of eighty falls in combat on the battlefield against the "lawful" heirs when he was unable to gain his aim of a united kingdom. The Nordic-Macedonian cultural offshoots, however, were not permanent enough. Admittedly, they provided Greek science, art and philosophy, but they did not possess the power to act as type-forming, to set through their idea of honor.The subjugated alien blood triumphed, the time of clever but characterless Hellenism began.

If the concept of honor has anywhere formed the center of all existence, then it is in the Nordic, Germanic West. With a self-reliance unique in history the Viking appears. The unbounded feeling of freedom pushes one Nordic wave after the other out into the unknown, as the population increases. With a squandering of blood and heroic unconcern the Viking sets up his States in Russia, in Sicily, England and France. Here primal racial impulses dominated without restraint and discipline, unhampered by reflection of purpose or an exactly determined system of law. The sole emphasis which the Northman carried with him, was the concept of personal honor. Honor and freedom drove individuals into the distance in the search for independence, into lands where there was space for masters, or the same urge caused them to fight to the last man on their farms and castles. A happy contentedness with earthly existence, remote from all trading interest, was the basic feature of Nordic man when he appeared in the West as a force forming history, in spite of all youthful impetuosity. Close followers grouped around individual personalities which then gradually led by necessity to the establishment of laws of social life and finally after migration a sedentary kind of rural life ensued (which in the south naturally fell to pieces, perished in late Oriental glittering decay).

> "Seldom is a second example offered to the observer of history, during which the conduct of a people could be determined so purely and completely by a sole highest value: all power, all property, every bond, every action, is directed to the service of honor, for which life is even offered as a sacrifice if necessary without reflection and without a flicker of the eyelashes. As the law of honor rules life, so it

> is reflected in poetry and passes as a fundamental principle through the world of sagas: one encounters there no second word so frequently as that of honor. Therefore the Nordic world of heroes with its wild discord, its bubbling-over subjectivism, is nevertheless so uniform in its nature and direction of destiny." (Krieck: "Menschenformung," p.154).

It is pleasant to find in advance these recognitions among circles of German scholars who hitherto had been caught up in graceful aestheticism. Here the nerve of destiny in our entire history is touched; our European and German future is decided from the nature of the valuation of the idea of honor. Even if ancient Nordic man acts violently, then the honor-conscious centre of his being creates a pure atmosphere even in battle and death. War could be conducted brutally but to admit to his deed was regarded as the first requirement of the Nordic man (Krieck). This feeling of responsibility demanded of each individual personality was the most effective defence against the moral swamp, against that hypocritical decomposition of values which in the course of European history has come over us as an alien temptation in the different forms of 'humanity.' Sometimes it called itself democracy, sometimes social sympathy, sometimes humility and love. The personal honor of the Northlander demanded courage and self-control. He did not gossip for hours like the Greek heroes before every battle; he did not cry out like the latter when wounded, but his consciousness of honor demanded calm and the conserving of strength. Seen from this aspect, the Viking is in fact the man of culture while the aesthetically perfected late Greek is the barbarian left behind devoid of a center. The words of Fichte: "True culture rests upon disposition," reveals our true Nordic nature when facing other cultures whose highest value is not character—which for us is synonymous with honor and duty—but another sense of value, another idea around which its life revolves.

The destinies of the Western peoples have taken on diverse forms in the course of time, conditioned by different circumstances. Everywhere that Nordic blood predominates, the concept of honor is present. However, it is also mixed with other ideals. This is revealed by vernacular sayings. In Russia the idea of a church, of religious feeling, has become dominant, which cloaks even the wildest outbreak with religious fervor (consider, for example, the man in Dostoevski's "Idiot" who commits a murder for the sake of a silver watch but says a prayer beforehand) the Russian therefore speaks of his motherland as "Swjataja Rossija," i.e. as Holy Russia. The Frenchman approaches life from the formal-aesthetic

aspect; France is therefore for him "La Belle France." Similarly the Italian. The Englishman is proud of his logical historical development, of tradition, firm, typical forms of life. He therefore admires his "Old England." But with us, in spite of many displeasing attributes, reference is still always made with identical fervor to "Deutsche Treue" (German loyalty) which proves that our metaphysical nature still feels the 'mark of honor' as its permanent base.

Around this concept of honor, then, ultimately revolved the lasting struggle over millennia, when Nordic Europe saw itself facing the armed Roman south and was finally subjugated in the name of religion and Christian love.

* * *

It is certainly beyond question that even without the intrusion of armed Roman-Syrian Christianity, an epoch of Germanic history—the mythological era—had ended. Nature symbolism would have given way to a new moral-metaphysical system, a new form of belief. But this form would undoubtedly have been invested by the same spiritual content, with the idea of honor as its leitmotif and yardstick. However, with Christianity a different spiritual value penetrated through and laid claim upon first place; love, in the sense of humility, mercy, subjection and asceticism. Today it is clear to every honest German that with this doctrine of love which included all creatures of the world in equal degree, a sore blow was thrust against the soul of Nordic Europe. Christiantity, in the way it took shape as a system, did not recognize the ideas of race and nation, because it represented a violent merging of diverse elements: it also did not recognize the idea of honor, because in pursuing Rome's later aims of power it proceeded with subjection not only of bodies but also of souls. But it is characteristic that the idea of love was in fact also unable to set itself through in the conduct of Church institutions. Both organizationally as well as dogmatically, the structure of the Roman system has been from the first day fundamentally and consciously intolerant and rejecting all other systems, not to say hate-filled towards them. Wherever it could, it proceeded to assert itself by excommunication, outlawry, fire, sword and posion. Apart form moral evaluations, we can only confirm this fact which indeed is not even denied by recent Roman Catholic writers. But this fact proves more than all others that no type-forming power is inherent in the idea of "love." Because even the organization of the "religion of love" has been built up without love. And in fact with much

less love than other type-forming powers. The ancient Goths tolerated—as Dollinger proves—both the Catholic as well as other beliefs, and showed a faith felt to be spiritually necessary as such. This toleration vanished everywhere when the spirit of "Bonifacius" and the compulsory law of "love" triumphed. In this connection one should compare the conduct of the "heathen" Frisian Duke Radbod in contrast to the Roman will to persecution. He remained true to the belief of his forefathers but nevertheless did not persecute the Christian preachers. When several particularly zealous Christian missioniaries were brought before him and one of them despite the Duke's resultant anger, still courageously represented the new faith, the "heathen" Duke said: "I see that you do not fear our threats and that your words are as your works," and sent the missionaries "back with all honors to Pippin, the Duke of the Franks." So reports Alcuin. In nobility of soul this pagan Frisian Duke stands far above the "representative of God" in Rome who made great efforts to banish this inner freedom and respect from the world. It is not easy for any German to express a negative evaluation in face of the Etruscan-Jewish-Roman system, for despite the way the latter is constructed, it has nevertheless been ennobled by the sacrifice of millions of German people. They have taken over what is alien in this, together with what is strange but spiritually related; respected the first less, shaped the second lovingly and asserted many a Nordic value within the whole. Nonetheless, today, at a time of great spiritual change, the truth demands the examination of what emanates from Rome concerning whether it is life-furthering or harmful to the nature of the Germanic West. This must be undertaken, not from the standpoint of personal ill-will, but by surveying the great tensions and de-tensionings of history over more than two thousand years and in investigation of the race soul values conditioning these upheaveals. Then we see that fundamentally the same struggle by the Greeks and Romans has fallen to the Germans. They can just as little escape this struggle as the other two great Nordic folk waves, because the latter in their ebbing-back carried within themselves the Asiatic spiritual values once overthrown by them and the human material embodying these values. They carried these with them over Hellas, far over the Alps, beyond the frontiers of German living space, at times into the heart of the Nordic race itself.

But if one traces back the causes why this was so successful, then one will discover that one of the most important factors was the challenge of Germanic greatness of heart, alongside the earlier technical superiority of the older, more experienced South and at a time of religious crisis in

Teutonic life which alone would not have explained such a long-lasting victory. This greatness of heart which is shaped allegorically forever in Siegfried, which presupposes with an opponent the same valuing of honor and open form of battle, indeed whose childlike honesty cannot believe the contrary, has contributed to many a hard defeat for the Germans in the course of their history; once when it began to admire Rome, in recent times when it carried out the emancipation of the Jews and thereby granted poison equal rights with healthy blood. The first took a terrible revenge in the wars of the heretics, in the Thirty Years War which brought Germany close to the abyss, the second has its revenge today when the poisoned German national body is seized by the gravest convulsions. And both these powers, hostile to us, still call upon the greatness of heart found with the gravely sick, call for the latter's "justice," preach "love" of all "humanity" and make efforts to finally gnaw away all remaining resistance of character.

A complete triumph of this "humanity" would have the same consequences as once the victory of Hither Asia over Athens and Rome, so that the latter, once the deadly enemy of the Etruscan-Pelasgian-Syrian world, became virtually the chief representative of these same forces after the original values of ancient Rome had collapsed; a collapse which was due to physical decomposition and the preaching of the all-oneness of humanity and love. But the doctrine of love was not a type-forming power even in its most beautiful form but a power melting resistance.

In order to preserve itself as a type-forming power and to assert itself further the Church could not and might not recognize any love. But it could certainly pursue power politics with the aid of love. If the consciousness of personality, of defending honor and of manly duty are transformed into humility and love-filled dedication, then the impulse to resistance against the forces organizing and directing the belief in the latter is broken. "A herd and a shepard!" This is, taken literally as was demanded, what had been the clearest declaration of struggle against the German spirit. If this idea had completely triumphed, then Europe today would consist only of a characterless human horde numbering many millions, ruled with the aid of a highly cultivated fear of purgatory and everlasting tortures of hell, paralyzed by "love" in the struggle for a feeling of honor, its better parts in service of a "humanitarian" philanthropism represented by "Caritas." This is the condition for which the Roman system was forced to strive, insofar as it wished to exist as such and as a spiritual and political power.

It is not my intention here to write a history of dogmas, but I wish only to describe a logical system with which (as far as his nature is concerned) an awakening Nordic man must by necessity come permanently into the gravest spiritual conflict. Either he subjects himself to it completely (as at times in the Middle Ages) or he rejects it according to feeling and consciously in principle. In the first event an external authority is attained for a brief time which, however, must collapse on account of its organic impossibility, as the great struggles show up to Dollinger; in the second event, the way is free for real organic culture and a true form of belief according to blood and race. The last centuries have stood under the mark of a compromise which did not touch upon any fundamental questions of world outlook but only organizational and political power relationships.

It is characteristic of Roman Christianity that where possible it eliminates the personality of its founder, in order to put in its place the Church structure of a rulership by priests. Jesus is admittedly set up as the highest and holiest, as the source of all a faith and bliss, but only for the purpose of investing the Church representing him with the halo of an eternal and untouchable glory. For between Jesus and man the Church and its representatives intrude with the assertion that the way to Jesus can only lie through the Church. Since Jesus does not live upon earth, man is in fact only concerned with this Church which is "fully authorized" to bind or release forever. The utilization of the belief in Jesus Christ ("The ruling Christ" as the author of the 'Heliand' poem calls him) for the power politics of a self-deifying league of priests forms the essence of Rome in the same way as under other names it formed that of priestly politicians in Egypt, Babylon and Etruria.

To strengthen the power of the doctrines and statutes protecting the priestly male league, a great art of dialectics was used by pious men which traced back all Church edicts over 1500 years to the Gospels, with the emphasis, however, that the Church alone possessed the right to dispense faultless dogmas of universal validity. Church Christianity of Catholic form and Protestant offshoot appears before us today as an historical phenomenon; the beginning and end allow themselves to be clearly surveyed. The building is completed, every beam has its supports, the dogmatic edicts all find their 'bases.' Now rigidity has appeared; one may thus speak about the building without needing to fear that one is falsely interpreting a living, still growing phenomenon in its driving forces.

Dr. Adam, a leading Catholic theoretician, assures us that:

"Catholicism is not completely identical with early Christianity or even

to be identified with the message of Christ, any more than the fully grown oak tree with the tiny acorn."

Here the sanctified arrogance of the Church (the work bears the stamp "Imprimatur") concerning Jesus is openly expressed and all further glorification of Christ serves, as said, only for the purpose of increasing the ruling tyranny of the Church, not the "message of Christ," of the "little acorn." The office of the Church rests completely in the hands of the priest who by the laying-on of hands becomes the representative of the Apostolic power. As a basis for this doctrine the words of Jesus to Peter are quoted, according to which he calls him the rock upon which he will build his Church. The fact that these words were a forgery inserted into the ancient texts much later by a 'true servant of the Church,' naturally does not prevent this demonstrably untrue doctrine from being repeated all over the world as the message of Jesus. This passage (Matthew 16, 18-19) is in fact an exceedingly clumsy one among the many pious forgeries, for a few verses later Jesus calls this same Peter a Satan who should 'get behind him.' Jesus says the same in Mark 8,30). Would he have wished to build up a church upon such a man so clearly described, whose betrayal of him Jesus likewise foresaw? Such an assumption approaches an open abusing of the personality of Christ. Merx says in conclusion: "Historical research concerning Jesus cannot allow itself to be deceived forever by such forgery; there must be an end of it." ("Die vier kanonischen Evangelien, III, 320).

Dr. Adam goes on: "When the Catholic priest spreads the word of Christ, then it is not a mere man who preaches, but Christ himself." By this, the self-deification of the priest has been elevated into a dogma which certainly contains the height of arrogance in the view that if anywhere a leading personality "elevated his own poor self into a bearer of Christ's message" the Church would at once have to utter its anathema over him: "And it would utter this anathema, even if an angel who came from heaven taught otherwise than has been accepted from the Apostles."

The last elimination of human self-reliance in favor of an unreal office is perfected in the Sacraments: "The sacramental blessing is not produced by the personal moral and religious efforts of the receiver of them, but far more through the objective completion of the sacramental token itself." With this, the annihilation of the personality is demanded, its valuelessness as "religious" doctrine is announced. In the midst of a people who had placed honor—personal honor, family honor, race honor, national honor—above all else as the midpoint of life, the open broadcasting of

such a demand would never have been able to be carried through. This has only been possible through the skilled replacing of the concept of honor by that of "love," followed by humility and devotion. That this "sacramental token" is represented as having been "established" by Jesus himself, should be noted only as a small proof of with what lack of concern 'history' is formed and 'structures of religion' are built.

It is self-evident that these ideas of a doctrine aiming at magic could not be maintained in such barren representation even after the denial of honor as a guiding idea. The blood-related customs of Nordic man and his knightly way of thinking were unable to be completely driven out even with fire and sword. So the Church then proceeded to the incorporation of popular pre-Christian parables into its system which was apparently ready even "before early Christianity." According to Adam, the Church was already there, in disposition, in seed—virtually—before Peter and John were converted.

Belief in Wotan was admittedly dying but the sacred groves in which the god was worshipped, remained the goal of Germanic pilgrims. All destruction of the Wotan symbols and the cursing of the old belief did not help. So in place of Wotan, Christian martyrs and saints such as Holy Martin, were set up. Cloak, sword and horse were his symbols (thus the same symbols as Wotan, Odin), the respected groves of the sword god became in this manner the places of Holy Martin, the saint of war, who is still worshipped today by German pilgrims (cf. Schwertslocher chapel). St. George and St. Michael also represent the re-naming of old Nordic deities who through this "baptism" arrived in the domain of the Roman Church. The "She Devil" Lady Venus has been transformed into Saint Pelagia; Donar, the Thunderer and the Cloud God became Saint Peter guarding heaven; the Wotan-like character of the wild huntsman is imparted to St. Oswald, and on chapters and carvings the redeemer Widar is shown tearing the Fenris Wolf to pieces (for example, at Berchtesgaden). The same Widar who in trying to save Odin swallowed by the Fenris Wolf, kills the monster. The comparison with Jesus is clear. Even the pious Hrabanus Maurus, the most learned Church teacher in Germany at the end of the 8th century, represents God as dwelling in the fortress of heaven, an idea which originates not from the Bible but from the heroic ancient Germanic soul.

On the first of May, old Germania celebrated the Walpurgis night, the beginning of the twelve festive nights of the summer solstice. It was the day of Wotan's (Wodan, Odin) wedding with Freya. Today the sacred Walburg celebrates its name-day on the first of May, while all customs

have been altered by the Church into magic and witchcraft, nature symbolism being thus transformed into Oriental diabolism.

In Regensburg a chalice is preserved on a copper-gilded stand, which is only drunk from on 'John's day.' This was the ancient form of festive wine for communion (which was still preached by the Church in both forms in the 13th century) on December 27, the after-celebration of the winter solstice. In remembrance of very old love potions wine is still handed around from 'St. Sebastian's skull cup' even today (for example, in Ebersberg, Upper Bavaria). This "drinking to love," and drinking for luck to St. John the Baptist, to St. Martin and St. Stephen are all very old customs. The devout Catholic Johann Nepomuk Sepp says: "The cup of Christ has been withheld from laymen by Rome but the folk has not allowed the ancient pagan cup to be taken from it."

Along with customs, songs and images also altered. We see Oswald the Holy illustrated in the book of Saints of 1488. He sits upon a throne in royal dress and crown. Around him fly the two ravens of Odin. Only the palms and the shepherd's crook are Christian additions. Odin is still worshipped today under the name of Oswald and, for example, he has his church in Traunstein but also sacred places on the Lower Rhine, in Holland, and in Belgium. Even the legend of St. Kuemmernis goes back to the figure of Odin as the Edda describes him to us, when Odin hung "on the windy tree" for nine nights wounded by a spear. The figure of a bearded, crucified man (Odin, Donar) who throws down a golden shoe to those who pray to him, recurs in many old sculptures and as motif in many songs. The female St. Kuemmernis has developed from this figure in a way still not completely clarified.

The Church thus had to accommodate itself, to set its saints upon fiery steeds, to send them swinging sword and spear into battle with dragons and other foes, to acquire honor and fame or to save captured virgins from the clutches of an evil-doer. The statues of Roland and St. George are examples of this kind which were only gradually replaced by those of Mary: in place of the symbol of honor the allegory of "love" appeared.

The Nordic gods were figures of light with spear and radiant cross and swastika, the symbols of the sun, of fertile ascending life. Since long before 3000 BC, Nordic folk waves carried these symbols, as can be proved, to Greece, Rome, Troy and India. Minutius Felix is zealous against the pagan cross; until finally the Roman (T-shaped) gallows upon which Jesus was nailed, had to be recast to this pagan, now "Christian" cross and the pagan sun or cross of heaven appeared as saintly light above the heads of church martyrs or messengers of faith. Today we

experience the birth of a new science: that of interpretation of ancient Germanic symbolism. The circle with the four spokes appears as a cross of heaven, i.e. as a projection of the directions of the sky, the sixfold division as points of the summer-winter solstice. It is this symbolism of a cosmic kind which passes through all the centuries, taken over mysteriously as the last fragments of a time which laid down its world picture of the father of heaven, birth, death and eternity with symbols instead of with letters. The allegories of the sun are an excerpt from this world picture. The ray of light, the lance, becomes the allegory of ruling. The "riding god" with the lance therefore appears again and again anew on "Christian" memorial stones and designs: this was the eternal wanderer Wotan (Odin, Wodan) riding through the history of Christianity. Divided into many figures, this god lived and cast spells as St. Oswald, as St. George, St. Martin, as a rider with the lance, indeed as Saint Kuemmernis in Catholic countries and today as "der Wode" still passes invisibly through the soul of the people in Lower Saxony. "As long as a people lives, its gods are immortal." That was Wotan's revenge after his decline. Until Baldur arose again and called himself the saviour of the world.

In Rome (also in Wittenberg) they were deeply outraged concerning this primal strength of ancient Nordic tradition which even "Bonifacius" and his successors up to the present day could not completely destroy. But there was nothing left other than to re-name the other figures of the gods as Christian saints and to transform their features in this manner. How this was carried out according to plan, is shown by countless Papal edicts. Thus, for example, Pope Gregory the great writes to Augustine, the missionary to the "pagans" who begs him for advice on the best way to convert the latter: "For in our time (around 600) may the Holy Church certainly turn with glowing zeal towards better men, but others she tolerates, yet in such manner that she often suppresses the evil which she fights, particularly by such tolerance and disregard." (Bede I, 27). And on July 22, 601, the same Pope writes to the Abbot Mellitus that if the pagan temples could not be destroyed, one might "transform" them: "Then if the people does not see its temples destroyed, it may lay aside error from its heart. . .and gladly find its way, according to old custom, to the place familiar to it." And about allowing offerings: "When some joys are allowed to them outwardly in such measure, then may many accustom their mind easier to the inner joys. For quite certainly it does not happen that one cuts off hard dispositions all at once, indeed because even he who wishes to rise up to the highest peaks, works his way up by stages. . .

not at one leap" (Bede I,30,Cp.Th. Hanlein: "Die Bekehrung der Germanen zum Christentum," Leipzig 1914 and 1910, 1,57 and 64).

But the festivals of the Christian Church appeared on the same day as the early peoples celebrated them, whether these were the festival of the fertility goddess Ostara, which became the Easter Resurrection festival, or the festival of the winter solstice, which became the birthday of Jesus. Thus the Catholic Church in its fundamental forms in Northern Europe has also been conditioned in a Nordic manner. The grotesque thing about this fact is only that it seeks to make a virtue out of necessity and claims the richness of spiritual life exclusively in favor. The coercive Church dogma declares in all seriousness that every national complexion can have a place in the Church, that every kind of religiosity is under its protection; nowhere has "the personal freedom of religious expression been so protected as in the Catholic (!) Church." (Adam). This is naturally a reversal of facts which speak only too clearly. From Bonifacius by way of Ludwig the Pious who made efforts to exterminate everything Teutonic with fire and sword, over nine million murdered heretics, we pass to the Vatican Council which up to the present represents a unique attempt to assert a merciless uniform spiritual belief, one form, one compulsory dogma, one language and one rite, identically for Nordics, Levantines, Negroes, Chinese and Eskimos. (One should consider in this connection, the Eucharistic Congress in Chicago in 1926 where Negro bishops celebrated mass). For two thousand years the eternal blood of all races and peoples revolted against this. But just as the idea of a world monarchy has exercised a hypnotizing influence on strong personalities from Alexander to Napoleon, so also the idea of one Church ruling the entire world. And just as this first idea forced millions under its sway, so also did the second, as an idea, although it did not achieve complete subjection in its effect. Therefore the great men of the early Middle Ages also regarded the Roman Church as an ally, or at least as a helper for the realization of romantic plans of power. The Church on its part saw in a "worldly" arm equipped with weapons, a means for creating a free path for its intentions. Examination of the inner motives for this, reveals that this struggle was essentially one for predominance, concerning what should be regarded as a supreme metaphysical value, a character value: Love, humility, denial, submission or honor, dignity, self-assertion, pride.

* * *

Love was only demanded and practiced by the supporters and lower grades of the Roman system; in order to have permanence and to stimulate strong natures, the leadership needed glitter, strength, power over the bodies and souls of men. Undoubtedly, a great spiritual readiness for sacrifice has been cultivated through this system: what the Catholic Church calls with pride its "Caritas." But it is particularly here, in its most beautiful human effect, that an equally powerful difference in the evaluation and consequence of an apparently identical action is shown. As the mercy of God is provided only through the Church, so also are good deeds and mercy only a gift of the Church to the unfortunate, to the sinner. This represents a cleverly weighed competition for broken men, with the purpose of binding them to a center of power and bringing before them their nothingness in the sight of God but simultaneously the power represented by the triumphant Church. But this thought process also lacks everything which we would describe as knightliness. A Nordic people determined by the concept of honor would assert that someone in need should be supported not in the name of condescending love and mercy but in the name of justice and of duty. This would have had as consequence not a subservient humility but an inward honesty, not the breaking of personality but its strengthening, that is, the re-awakening of the consciousness of honor.

To this context belongs pity of Christian Church kind which has also appeared in new form in the "Humanitarianism" of Freemasonry and which led to the greatest desolation of our entire life. From the coercive dogma of unrestricted love and the equality of all mankind before God on the one side, from the teaching of "human rights" supported by democratic racelessness and without national-rooted ideas of honor on the other, European society has virtually "developed" as protector of the inferior, the sick, crippled, criminal and rotten. "Love" plus "humanitarianism" has become a doctrine decomposing all commandments of life and the life forms of people and State, and, as a result, has come into conflict with present-day avenging Nature. A nation whose middlepoint was represented by honor and duty, would not preserve the corrupt and criminal but eliminate them. We also see by this example that the raceless scheme in its lust for uniformity, pairs itself with unhealthy subjectivism, while a social and State community welded together by honor and duty must out of justice eliminate material privations and make efforts to increase the consciousness of individual value within this enforced discipline, but in such a way that, likewise through necessity, it would separate those racially and spiritually unfit for Nordic forms of life.

The one or other results when honor is set up as the highest value of all actions and the protection of the Nordic European race is given prime importance.

A typical example of how the Roman system utilized human weaknesses for its purposes, is shown by the compulsory dogma of the selling of indulgences. The Church asserts that it possesses a "fulness of representative atonement" towards the poor "sinner" on behalf of Jesus and the Saints. For releasing and binding by virtue of their 'divine trust' it has the approval of Jesus at its disposal in dealing with a particular evil-doer (in fact it was the African Tertullian who extended the doctrine of "dealer" with much use of legal hair-splitting). It has been attempted to surround this doctrine with many mysterious interpretations and to build up an entire philosophy on this representation of absolution. However, its sub-basis of dealing in the sense of trading will not remain concealed from any deeply perceiving man trading in both spiritual as well as material aspect. Fundamentally, the idea of absolution is based upon the keeping of accounts which the Church is at convenience to manipulate by choosing convenient figures. This is a cultivation of emptiness of character and spirit, apart from other consequences such as appeared in Luther's time when a business representative of the Fuggers always accompanied Tetzel and took away from him all money received, because otherwise the Augsburg traders would never have been paid by Rome. The "Holy Year" invented by Boniface VIII brought in a huge income from the sale of indulgences. But the Jubilee absolution could only be purchased in Rome. At first the "Anno sancto" was to be celebrated every 100 years. Then it was held every 50, every 33, finally every 25 years, to obtain large sums of money more frequently. The first "Holy Year" brought the Pope 200,000 foreign vistors and 15 million golden guldens. In 1350 the Vatican took in 22 million. One therefore understands who after the 33 years celebrated "in remembrance of Jesus's years of life" (as the festival was called after the second shortening of the interval betweeen 'Holy Years'), an interval lasting only 25 years was introduced "on account of the brevity of human life." One sees that even the martyr's death of Jesus can be good for furthering the business of his "representative." In order to obtain even more gold, the opening and closing of the "golden gates" was introduced for the "Holy Year": whoever went in there and left behind his offering, could also free his friends from all sins. In 1500, Alexander VI used the income of the Jubilee indulgence for the dowry of his daughter Lucrezia. Every crime had its firmly fixed price with which one could buy oneself free: murder of

parents, incest, had to be paid for highly. Only Protestant criticisms controlled corruption. Thereafter, indulgence was reserved for magical customs (carrying of holy relics, privileged altars, etc). Similar business was carried on by all lesser Church establishments. The monastery of Monte Cassino, for example, had a yearly income of 500,000 ducats and around the year 1500 comprised 4 Bishoprics, 2 Principalities, 350 castles, 440 villages, 336 estates, 23 harbor settlements, 33 islands, 200 mills and 1662 churches! One example among thousands. In addition came the transfer of giant sums as dues to the Pope, Peter's pennies, dispensation monies, etc. The very worst despots of the earth have not been more greedy than the "representatives" of the man whose kingdom was not of this world.

The doctrinal principle of absolution was only possible because during its formation the idea of a feeling of personal honor had not taken effect. It had to extend its sway further, to undermine the still existing consciousness of honor and to give the stamp of piety to slavish thinking. The German rebellion against this disgrace compelled the Roman system to be more cautious in organizing the system of indulgences. Fundamentally, however, it is still defended today as a just and pious practice of the Church (cf. the general Indulgence summons of 1926). It is self-evident that this mischief is likewise traced back to "ancient Biblical practices." A thousand-year-old re-disciplining of countless successive generations around a new pole—Rome—has had such a strong effect on the non-Nordic undercurrent of the European peoples that this summons to divided mankind is not even felt by them as a disgrace, but as mutual aid by the "limbs of the body of Christ."

The idea of intercession by the Church emanates from this same mode of thought which abandons the idea of honor. On the basis of resolutions of the Councils at Lyons, Florence and Trient, the condition of purgatory between life on one side and of eternal damnation or eternal purgatory on the other was introduced and the authority approved for the Church to conduct purgatory to a worthwhile end through its intercession. If one strips this doctrine of all its trimmings, i.e. takes it just as it is intended, namely not as real intercession and spiritual remembrance of the departed, but as an action which influences the passage of the soul after death, then we have the most ordinary magical belief such as the South Sea peoples still practice today. From a philosophical aspect, the dogmas of selling indulgences and of effective intercession (along with several others, such as the doctrine of the scapulary and the holy annointings and miracle-working relics) represent the final outcome of a world outlook

whose type is the medicine man. The medicine man whose prayer brings or prevents rain, whose curse kills, who has concluded a pact with God or the gods and can force or at least influence him (or them) in every way by some magical practice.

(An event not fitting strictly into this work, but which is of deep inner significance, may be mentioned here as characterizing this spiritual attitude. On Corpus Christi day in 1929 at Munich, the procession was suddenly surprised by a violent thunderstorm. The monks, nuns, ministers, etc, seized their crucifixes and candles under their arms and ran in all four heavenly directions. Later, Cardinal Faulhaber preached in the Frauenkirche and admonished the faithful not to allow their faith to be shaken by the bad weather, even if Jesus had this time not accepted the offering brought to him. . .Jesus is here represented as a rainmaker and the rained-upon Corpus Christi procession as an unsuccessful attempt at sorcery! The medicine man philosophy thus exactly characterizes the spiritual conduct of the Roman Church.)

The medicine man as a demonic figure can utilize independent thought by his supporters just as little as consciously honorable actions. Logically, to secure his position, he must make efforts to eliminate the one as well as the other with all the means at his disposal. He must excessively cultivate all-too-human anxieties and hysterical tendencies; he must preach witchmania and demonic sorcery; he must suppress with Index, fire and sword all inquiry that can lead to other results or even to liberation from the entire world picture taught by the medicine man. The medicine man throws such as Roger Bacon into prison in the same way as Galileo; he must declare the work of Copernicus outlawed and under ban and make efforts to destroy all systems of thought which wish to assert honor, duty and loyalty between men—teachings in accordance with a personality of high value, as powers shaping life. To describe the attempt to assert the magical-demonic world conception of the medicine man in a world political sense, means to write Roman dogma and Church history. Rome has thus not only understood how to secure the "representation of God" in the eyes of millions but by working on the deliberately cultivated magical belief of certain sections within the different peoples also kept awake the belief in the universal power of its practices as being only possessed by the priest (such as indulgences, the last annointing, etc) in contacting the other world. Other devices of similar kind in foreign lands were more logical in this respect. At the same time the Pope knew how to escape responsibility for this sorcery. The teacher and headman of a "primitive" tribe boasting of magical powers will be killed, if his sacrificial ceremon-

ies are fruitless and lead to drought or a universally destructive flood. The emperor of China was equal to God; as the son of heaven he was worshipped as such, but he was responsible for the prosperity of people and State. The Pope has rendered impossible the further examination of his assertions by those believing in him as a result of his transferring their effect from this world into the other. However, if healing by hypnosis happens occasionally to be successful then the Catholic papers are filled with news about this although they tenaciously keep silent about the thousands who leave the places of pilgrimage unaltered. Since nothing is spared in the painting of pictures of Hell—an idea unfamiliar to the devout Ulfilas, for which no German word was descriptive—so Rome enchains the hopes of frightened millions to its rites by experiment. This method has also contributed much to the durability of the Roman system.

The attempt to put the world in a state of bewitchment has admittedly misfired, although not completely. The initial technical superiority of southern lands over the Germanic ones, the consequent extermination of those who were free, proud and conscious of honor with the aid of every conceivable alliance, the clever falsification of Nordic customs which remained as such in existence, only under different control. . .all this has not been without disadvantageous effects.

Jesuitism has drawn the last logical conclusions from the Roman system. The final stone in the structure of the medicine man philosophy was laid by the Vatican Council. Here the medicine man was declared as God, as infallible God for the duration of exercise of his office. Strictly speaking, Jesus is no longer represented but deposed; deposed and replaced by the Roman system, crowned by the medicine man invested with all power, who calls himself Pope. "The New Testament is indeed an important but not entirely exhaustive product of this apostolic tradition permeating the entire consciousness of the Church," condescendingly writes the afore-mentioned modern Catholic theoretician, Professor Adam.

Jesus is pushed aside, the Syrian-Etruscan superstition which at the beginning enveloped his personality like weeds, appears in his place as "Apostolic tradition."

In fact, the Roman dogma does not regard the concept of honor as a problem in itself. It had, by necessity systematically to eliminate the latter from its basic standpoint which demanded only subjection. The training school for the conscious extermination of the defiant appearance of this spiritual power in Western life is undoubtedly represented by that body which as if in mockery, describes itself as the "Society of Jesus"; the manner in which Ignatius Loyola wished to see the imitators of Jesus

perform spiritual exercises thus signifies the uttermost contrast to Germanic thought and feeling. There is still dispute concerning what influences have been most fundamental in the inward and outward shaping of the Basque Loyola. To be true, the pious "voices of Maria Laach" are of opinion that "the supernatural origin of the little book of exercises" cannot "be doubted by any rational person," but this childish attempt, as well as other fresh products which are attributed to "divine dictate" are somewhat embarrassing even to the priesthood. It is evident that the writings of Pater Garcia de Cisnero of Manresa, in the form of the Benedictine and Franciscan rules, exercised great influence upon Ignatius, but also the principles of the Moorish religious and political societies which extended over North Africa as far as Spain, must have been known to him since an astonishing resemblance exists between the Musulman order and the principles of the Society of Jesus. The Musulman texts teach: "Thou shalt be under the hands of thy Sheik like a corpse in the hands of the watchman of the dead." "Obey thy Sheik in everything that he orders, for it is God himself who commands through his voice." (Livre de ses appuis de Scheich Si-Snouissi, "Les Origines de la Compagnie de Jesus," Paris 1898. Cf. also Charabounel: "L'Origine Musulmane de Jesuites.") Ignatius in his famous letter demands the same kind of obedience: blind obedience, corpse-like obedience. The lucidity of blind obedience would vanish in the event of one's posing the question as to good and evil in the face of a command. If it is necessary to fulfil an order by the superior then 'whatever it might be, a blind urge to obey will draw us with it, without leaving the slightest room for reflection.' It was on March 26, 1553, when the demand for corpse-like obedience was flung as an open challenge into Germanic-Western spiritual life: "Lay aside, beloved brother," writes Ignatius, "as much as possible your will and hand over and sacrifice your freedom. . ." "You must obey with a certain blind urge, allow yourself to drift devoid of will without any kind of investigation, to do whatever your Superior says. . ." In the "Constitutions" we read: "Each shall be convinced that whoever lives in obedience shall allow himself to be led by the Superior, as if he be a corpse, allowing himself to be carried and laid down here and there in every manner; or as if he be the stick of an old man which serves him who holds it where and ever he will. . ." In his "Rules" which Loyola added to the "Exercises," he again demanded "complete removal of personal judgement" and furthermore, "when something appears white to our eyes which the Church has defined as black, then this is likewise to be declared as black." Subjection is demanded, completely irrespective of whether the

servant holds something to be sinful or dishonorable; even the restriction, however threadbare, made earlier is lacking here, that one needs only to disobey when an "open sin" is demanded.

(A "Memorial" of the Jesuit college at Munich elaborates the 5th and 6th rules concerning obedience: "He obeys blindly, who like a corpse or the stick of an old man, having no feeling and no judgement, so obeys as if he had chained his own judgement and to a certain degree completely eliminated this (*totum eclipsatum*) so that he no longer has a judgement of his own and is unable to see but has made the judgement by another completely his own, namely that of his Superior, and in fact so completely and so perfectly that whatever his Superior judges and feels, he himself judges and feels exactly the same, and that this judgement by his Superior be his own unfalsified and natural judgement. This is the power of true self-denial and of truly making oneself blind (*excaecatio*), to be impelled no longer by personal, but by another's stimulus." (Reusch, Archivalische Beitrage: Zeitschrift fur Kriechngeschichte. 1895. XV, 263.)

But even the most zealous Western members of the Church could not tolerate this openness, this courage of accepting the final logical consequence from the prerequisites of the Roman system. Even the Roman and the Spanish Inquisition rebelled against this all to clear language. Protests resounded from all corners of the earth against this demand for dishonorableness and slavishness. A public condemnation of the Jesuit doctrine also nearly occurred, however, the cunning Bellarmin—in the interests of the "unity of the Church"—was successful in avoiding this. (The French Jesuit Julian Vincent, who even in the year 1588 showed the courage to declare Ignatius's letter heretical, was thrown into prison by the Inquistion, then declared to be insane. Thanks to the loving care of the "Imitators of Christ" he died the year afterwards in prison.)

Whoever wishes to follow a similar case of the brutal enslaving of an upright man within the present Jesuit Order, should read the legal reports by the German Jesuit father Bremer concerning his struggle against the Jesuit General and how the Pope protected the latter contrary to all law. Bremer, a revered scholar, represented the old strict ideas concerning morals, which were simply banned as inconvenient. But the little Pater did not merely allow himself to be stifled like thousands of others and he defended his standpoint on the basis of Church law. This had as consequence one brutal act after another, then legal actions against the Pater, then his condemnation in Rome without his being

heard. Bremer openly raised the accusation of falsification of ancient documents against the Jesuit General and the Pope. Both had to allow this to occur. . .the splendid times of the Inquisition are over, otherwise Bremer would long since have rotted in a prison (further details can be found in Dr. F. Ernst: *Papst und Jesuitengeneral*, Bonn 1930). The demand by Ignatius to call white black if the Church so commanded, signified the declaring of holy the poisoning of souls,and was a recognition of the right to the destruction of conscience, the open elevation of a lie to a work of piety. The fact that this dogma, sucking away moral backbone, could not be completely carried out, lay once again not in the good will of the Church which 'alone could bring salvation' but only in the strong defense shown by the European spirit and in the impossibility even by retrogressive breeding over decades, to burn out the European consciousness of honor. Today they are even compelled to declare that Loyola's words, "dictated by God" are no longer true, it is no longer risked to openly demand corpse-like obedience and the abandonment of one's honor in the Jesuit schools. But the aim and the way of creating a herd of soulless slaves are drawn unmistakably clearly. The slavish practices of the Order which inject anxiety into the imaginative power and enslave the personal will, along with the subjection of the spiritual personality under the hypnosis of a strong central will, serve for breaking every feeling of dignity. The fact that the Church did not condemn the doctrine of corpse-like obedience shows that it strove for the latter, like its tool, the Society of Jesus. And just as the Syrian-African Order wished to work for the "very greatest praise of God," so the Jesuit Order worked conscious of its goal, *Ad majorem dei gloriam*, for the disintegration of the Nordic-Germanic West, and naturally wormed its way in everywhere that a wound became noticeable in the body of a people.

It is not good and evil which are discussed here, but unchangeable values of character. Loyola was, even if ambitious, nevertheless a courageous man, but his enslaving system is the reversal of all European values. Just as the theoretical materialist can be personally a good and satisfactory man, so also the warlike Loyola became the symbol of the most unscrupulous struggle against the soul of the Nordic race. Nothing is falser than to compare his Exercises with the Prussian educational system, as often happens with the purpose of obscuring the facts, because these two forms of a type-training league of men represent irreconciliable opposites. Loyola abolishes the uniform dress of monks, rejects excessive asceticism, sends his representatives in disguise among the "affiliated" in all cities, allows them greater freedom in their outward

life. In return the Jesuits sacrifice to the Order all personal enquiry, personality, human dignity—in the last analysis, their racial-spiritual nature. The Prussian soldier was subject outwardly to harsh discipline, but inwardly he was free. The first system does not recognize the idea of honor, and whenever it encounters this, attempts to trample it down; the second revolves solely around the idea of honor. The first was and remains a fungus in the midst of our life, an acid dissolving all the strength and greatness of our ancient past; the second was and remains the primal cell for the structure of our entire existence as this was operative when it appeared for the first time openly in the light of history with the Vikings and the early Teutons.

After the Basque Ignatius, Lainez—a Jew—was chosen as his successor for the further development of the Roman dogma directed hostilely against us all. Its efficacy, namely at the Tridentine council and the consequences of the resolutions laid down there would be worthy of a German doctorate thesis. On July 18, 1870 the Jesuitical Vatican Council spoke its final creed:

> "We teach and declare that according to the will of the Lord, the Roman Church has predominance of proper authority of office over all others. . .that the judgement of the Apostolic Chair over which there is no higher power, may be withdrawn by none of a new confession, just as it is permitted none to sit in judgement over its judgement." "The chair of Saint Peter remains always unspotted by any error." "We declare it as a principle of faith revealed by God: that the Pope in Rome, when he speaks from his doctrinal chair (*ex cathedra*). . .decides a doctrine firmly adhered to by the entire Church, concerning faith or morality, is capable of the divine support promised him by Saint Peter, possesses that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer wished to provide his Church in deciding a doctrine concerning faith or morality . . . therefore if anyone should risk contradicting this our decision, which God forbid, he is under ban."

With this, the Roman-Jesuitical systematic destruction of personality was perfected. Admittedly, millions of true believing Catholics vaguely felt the monstrosity of this self-deification of an office in itself and a few men stood up to lay protest against this dishonoring of mankind which is the essence of the Vatican. The Catholic Rector of Prague University wrote in horror:

> "One permitted oneself to be killed off and indeed did it oneself, threw away conviction, belief, priestly and manly honor. That is the

> result of a development which sees the essence of Christianity in blind obedience towards the Roman hierarchy."

Bishop Strossmeyer declared that the Curia regarded the Papacy as carrion and hoped for the death of Pius IX which would signify a "truly good deed for mankind." J. Dollinger rejected the dogma "as a Christian, theologian and historian." Even the proud leader of the Center party, Windthorst, was nevertheless courageous enough, at least among friends, to reject the new doctrine of infallibility. As the Breslau prebendary Kunzer stated (*Norddeutsche Allgemeine*, January 11, 1871) he had to make the utmost efforts to calm Windthorst and he "sought to soften his fury against the Jesuits whom he declared guilty of everything and against whose expulsion he would not lift a finger." But what still seemed possible in the 16th century, was now in vain; nothing helped. Pius IX could even declare proudly of himself: "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life" (*Obs. catholique*, 1866, p.357) without the spiritually decomposed, enslaved Catholic world daring to protest against this presumption.

It is therefore not a question of the Pope dispensing any special commands as infallible, but solely the fact that this possibility is permitted him. A fragment of that intangible something which every people feels as center of its soul, has been broken off. The Pope will not, of course, openly demand anything dishonorable but the fact of the presentation of a complete *carte blanche* authority on the part of the Catholic world alone shows sufficiently that in service of "love" manly honor has been cast away. The Vaticanum signified the breaking of all men of character in the Church. And thus also at the present day: for existing dignitaries are already educated under the rule of this honorless dogma. So-called "political Catholicism" is only the necessary external side of the Jesuitical-Roman system in general, thus not the misuse, but the logical application, of Roman principles, even if misuse of the real religion. Then every spiritual force free from Rome, every worldly power independent of Rome appears as "falling away" from the "only legitimate rule," and every means is holy for regaining this spiritual political rule.

This system has known how to force the self-sacrifice of men influenced by "love" into the service of an unmerciful caste. By replacing the inner equilibrium of consciousness by humility and pity the spiritual dignity of the Nordic peoples was undermined. Wars, revolutions—in part utilized by Rome, in part directly called forth by Rome—brought increased physical and spiritual attrition with them, until with Democratic-Jewish sup-

port it became possible in 1870 to place the final stone in the roof of the building. And this signified: the abandonment of individual honor, of national and racial honor in favor of demands for government by a priestly society declaring itself to be God.

Seen in this connection, the greatness of Luther's deed does not consist in merely founding a Church but is much more important than the introduction of a division between two versions of faith. However much Luther may still have been deeply embedded in the Middle Ages, his deed signifies the great revolution in the history of Europe after the penetration of Roman Christianity. Luther denied the priesthood as a power in itself, i.e. denied the right of justification by a caste of men who claimed to be in closer relationship with the Godhead than others and who on the basis of alleged "knowledge of God" presumed they possessed better insight concerning God's plans for salvation and conditions in "Heaven." As a result, Martin Luther hindered the further advance of that magical monstrosity which had come to us from Central Asia by way of Syria and Africa. Monasticism is African in origin, so is the tonsure, and the anti-natural castrations by means of which one is supposed to be brought "nearer" to God are Central Asiatic in origin. The rosary is Asiatic and it is still used in present day Tibet where its mechanism has been perfected in the prayer wheel. The kissing of the Pope's feet is Asiatic, the Dalai Lama still demands the same today—and several other things which, however, could not be established in Europe. In this connection it is worth recalling the behavior of Alexander the Great. When he had conquered the whole of Hither Asia, he made the Asiatics kneel down when they greeted him, but with his Macedonians he acted as with comrades, a single attempt also at introducing obeisance from them but which failed at once. Here Nordic Europe already parted from Orientalism but Lamaism had completed its intrusion in the form of the Roman priest caste and continued the Oriental politics of the Babylonians, Egyptians and Etruscans. Martin Luther declared war on this spiritual collectivity, was victorious, and all Catholics still conscious of honor must thank his labor for the fact that the Papacy reformed itself and was forced to a purification, in order to continue to exist at all in the awakening cultural world of Europe.

It must now be made clear how things would have proceeded with the Germanic States if that spirit had triumphed which wished to link holiness with dirt and repellent life. Eusebius the Holy ran around with 260 pound iron weights, Saint Macarius purchased holiness for himself by bearing the tortures of an ant hill upon which he sat, Saint Francis—admittedly in

many ways a very great personality—paid tribute to the spirit of Asia by rolling around on thorns to the pleasure of God. Outstandingly pious nuns drank strangers' spittle, ate dead mice and rotten eggs, all so as to become "holier." The 'Pious' Hilarion is praised because he lived only in filth, the Holy Athanasius was proud of never having washed his feet, the same is reported of Abraham the Holy, of Sylvia the Holy. The nunnery of St. Euphrasia had even taken an oath that its nuns might never bathe. . .with unhindered further development of this "odor of sanctity" Europe today would have arrived at the same condition as the dirt-contemplating saints of India and Tibet, at a condition of the most perfected stupidity, of the most terrible superstition, of poverty and of misery—with a constant enrichment of the priest caste. Europe was saved because of the extent of the anti-Roman movements, and the greatest saviour of the West has therefore been Martin Luther because he combated the system from which the conditions described above resulted as a necessary consequence: the priesthood of Rome with its magic power, representing the continuation of the priestly societies of Hither and Central Asia. This German farmer's son thus became the axis of a new world development for which all Europeans must be thankful since he not only made the Protestants free, but also saved Catholics from spiritual decline. The later return of many fallen centers (Vienna, Munich, were once Protestant cities) to Catholicism thus only became possible through an enforced cleansing of the odor of sanctity. However, it must also never be forgotten that if the Protestant spirit were no longer to exist, the Tibetan-Etruscan world would reveal itself anew (Spain, which was least Protestant, has felt the rule of Rome bitterest of all, and nowhere in Europe was there such backwardness of spirit and soul as in Spain before the revolution of April 1931). How deeply Satanic superstition still prevails even today in the very highest posts, has been revealed to an astonished world by the Leo Taxil swindle which is on the same level as the exorcising of the Devil by devout churchmen in all States.

* * *

The essence of the conflict between Emperor and Pope was first of all the struggle for predominance between knightly honor and the enervating doctrine of love. The living allegory of the first is the sword with the hilt in the form of a cross and the bishop riding on a battle-charger. Without question, knightly honor predominated at first; even a Charlemagne would laughingly have rejected a Pius IX. But Charlemagne held it as

expedient to allow his dignity to be sanctified through religion and to proclaim his rule over the peoples as originating from God's blessing. Emperor and Pope were thus at first political allies against the "Noble Saxons" to whose fame it is—according to Goethe—that they hated Christianity in the form offered. Widukind admittedly fought for himself, but simultaneously for the freedom of all Nordic peoples. At the same time, Charlemagne remains the rugged founder of the German Reich as a political unit. After the reestablishment of the honor of Saxony which had been derided for 1000 years, both great opponents pass into German history: Charlemagne as the founder of the German Reich, Widukind as defender of the Germanic values of freedom.

Loyalty by vassals and loyalty between men were likewise regarded by the old knights as above possessions and happiness, as with the author of the Edda. The Havamal closes with the words:

Possessions die,
Families die,
You yourself will also die;
One thing I know,
That never dies:
The fame of dead men's deeds.

This is the Nordic form of the Buddhist Karma doctrine. In the Beowulf poem a mingling of the Germanic feeling of honor with the Christian idea of redemption is attempted, namely insofar as Beowulf undertakes to save outraged, tortured humanity; but he does not fight with aid of the principle "resist not evil," but as "a hero, the terror of the wicked." (Cf. in this connection Vishnu who appears in the world again and again for the destruction of evil-doers). But a certain soft undertone already makes itself perceptible in Beowulf. While it was regarded as dishonorable for the ancient Germans to return home from the battlefield without their lord and leader, the miserable behavior of the "disciples" of Christ in the garden at Gethsemane (which also seemed very painful to the poet of the *Heliand*) has already cast a shadow here. With exception of one loyal man the followers of Beowulf abandon him when they are seized by forebodings of death! This completely un-Nordic, soft-hearted feature is in fact again countered by a conscious praise of honor: "No event can weaken the man of noble blood." "The end of this life threatens us all; therefore whoever can, should attain fame before death!" Finally, the

dishonorable and disloyally fleeing men have banishment pronounced over them:

Now to all your race be refused
The gift of swords and of bright treasures,
Joys of homeland and of the native hearth:
bare of the rights of our life
shall each be, when far away,
the noble learn of your flight,
that infamous deed. Death is better
for each noble man than a disgraceful life.

The Germanic knight also allows unpraiseworthy actions to be placed to his account, actions which result from weakness of will or the breaking through of lower impulses. But when he afterwards accepts them and takes the consequences upon himself, then we understand this more than the cowardly behavior of the first Apostles. A grim figure like Hagen seems to us significantly greater than, for instance, Peter the "rock." Hagen throws away his honor in service of his king and at last dies for it proudly and unbroken. The gossip Peter denies his Lord at the first test, doubly and trebly; the sole expression of emotion which allows him to appear sympathetically, when he draws his sword (which the poet of *Heliand* describes with perceptible relief), is very typically overshadowed by his later cowardly lies. Church tradition vainly makes efforts to turn Peter into a hero. But the devout poet of the *Heliand* poem attempts to excuse the behavior of the disciplines in Gethsemane by their sorrow, for otherwise their sleep would appear dishonorable and therefore incomprehensible to his Saxon audience:

. . .The born of the Lord
Found them sleeping in sorrow!/their hearts were heavy
that the dear Lord/was to leave them.

The development from chivalry to knighthood already began under Konrad II and this was maintained until far into the 14th century. The knights saw themselves as "children of the Empire" and were thus under obligation to defend emperor and kingdom against external foes. This fact gave them justification for the existence of their order, it led to the actual knightly concept of honor which is its first worldly representation

attaining some highest purpose in accordance with social rank. After the almost complete subjectivism of the Vikings and the old Germanic captains with their followers, a large section of the people was consequently adjusted to the spiritual centerpoint of the entire race. The practice of granting a sword, of girding, finally the knighting ceremony, represented symbolically an inward elevation and ennobling. If the later knight through his becoming ossified and stereotyped represented a fragment of antiquity amidst a new social life, if the plundering raids of idle knights during peace also offer a displeasing picture, then these are things which even the best idea does not escape containing, and the fact remains that up to the present the word "knightly" is used to describe only a man who greatly protects his fellow men and knows how to safeguard honor.

* * *

It is self-evident that the Roman system also made efforts to render the Knights Order serviceable to itself which, among other things, found expression in the dedication of the sword. At the very beginning of his oath-taking, the knight obligated himself to serve religion, then to stand by the oppressed, and only lastly to grant the Emperor obedience. This was the formal establishment of a Roman influence, such as had already been carried out earlier. Certain pious historians have even attempted to trace back the foundation of the Knights Order to Rome (like their dogmas to Jesus) and in fact Gregor VII is cited as their founder. This naturally only occurs with the intention of bringing even the representation of this anti-Roman idea—by tracing its origin back to the Pope—into dependency upon the latter, naturally with different consequences resulting from it for the present. Thus, for example, the historian Gfrörer knows how to relate the manner in which the knightly idea of holy Rome originated, in order to then unveil the latter's intentions: "Only as a result of the powerful influence which the Church gained through the office of Gregory VIII on the warriors Order of the Western Christian kingdoms and in fact on the Roman first, did the Knights Order attain its full substance as an institution or corporation which laid upon it the task of rendering serviceable by special duties the heroic courage of the soldiers of religion." Fame, honor, race, people, emperor and kingdom, were and are thus regarded by the representatives of the Roman system as mere names and subordinates; as the purpose of such a Knights Order is falsely attributed to the Pope, only service for the latter appears. By this the unchangeable politics of the Roman Church have also become

completely clear and in fact it has been successful by means of hypnotizing sermons to shed torrents of blood for the power-hungry Church in countless crusades, to make "the heroic heart serve religion," to subordinate honor to "love." "Iper and Arras," cry the Flemings, "Husta heya Beyerlant," ran the battle-cry of the Bavarians; Rome could not prevent this but it could sow discord by playing-off different interests against each other. And it has regarded this as its life's task up to today. Out of instinct for self-preservation Rome cannot tolerate any organiaztion which is conscious of its people and honor, even less a self-sufficient, completely honor-conscious nation. Therefore it must promote dissension, sow war and racial decomposition. This is inherent in the nature of its raceless system and will not alter, as long as this system exists.

Another, apparently ineradicable falsification of history dominates even today those circles which give a clear account of Rome and its system, namely that all education and culture which gradually passed over the West was a consequence of Church activity. In fact, the exact opposite is the case.

Pressed by the Langobards, Pope Stephan II (in approximately 755) begs for aid and implores that he might be invited into Franconia. This takes place and Pippin receives the Pope on foot, but the latter, conscious of his weak position, shows himself as the poor apostle of Christ, wraps himself and his priests in hair shirts, strews ashes on his head and on his knees implores the king to help the Roman people. Since this time France has regarded itself as the eldest daughter of Rome (wisely refusing, however, since Hugo Capet, the enticements of a Roman title). The same Pope then works against the union of Charlemagne with a Langobard woman. He writes that Charles might not pollute in a disloyal and "most stinking manner" the "high, noble and kingly race" of the Franks with the blood of the Langobards and in such event begs Heaven to hand over Charles to the "eternal flames." But since this threat made no impression upon the Emperor, the Holy Father later allied himself with this same "stinking" Langobard king.

At the time, when the spiritual influencing on the world is said to have been performed from Rome outwards, things in reality proceeded there in a highly unspiritual manner. In 896, Pope Stephan VI hit upon the idea of digging up the decomposed corpse of his predecessor condemning the dead man to death at a Synod as an evil usurper, hacking three fingers off his "perjured" corpse and handing him over to the Roman "people" to be drowned. Shortly afterwards, Stephan himself was flung into prison and stangled while the corpse of his predecessor was once again fished

out of the Tiber and newly robed as Pope.

After this, the Popes alternately, overthrow one another, and imprison each other by turns until Sergius III, his concubine Marozia at his left hand, ascends the "chair of Peter." This woman Marozia, along with her mother Theodora, secures herself influential bishops as lovers and props of her rule. When Sergius was disposed of Marozia, after a brief pause, raised her son to be Pope as John XI. Her first son Albrich was highly outraged at this and overthrew the rule of his mother. After his death his son occupied the Papal office as John XII. But conditions still did not improve. In 938, the expelled Pope Boniface VII was successful in throwing his rival "representative of Jesus" into prison and leaving him to die there. But Boniface also did not enjoy the tiara for long, he was driven out himself by the royal nobility and by the woman Theodora, already mentioned, the famous mother of that very energetic whore Marozia, whose grandson Crescentius became master of Rome and who now sold the Papal chair to willing creatures. In 1024 a man took the Papal throne who had previously never been a cleric. He bought himself the representation of God and called himself John XIX. Later a ten year old son of a Count was elected as Pope Benedict IX. But since the latter gave himself up prematurely to every conceivable vice, he became too dissolute even for the Romans; they therefore elected a new representative of Christ, who called himself Sylvester III. But the new Pope was soon seized with anxiety at the dangers of his office and preferred to barter the latter for 1,000 pounds to Gregory VI, at which the expelled Benedict was morally outraged and raised renewed claim to the chair of Peter. The honorable cardinal Caesar Baronius openly called these Popes "whore's stallions." This scandal only ceased when Emperor Henry III intervened.

These were the conditions in Rome during the 10th and 11th centuries which every German ought to be familiar with but concerning which silence is wisely kept by a school of historical writing filled with lies on the one side and cowardly silence on the other. At this very time began the national gathering of the Germans under Heinrich I and the conscious attempt at national recovery and development under Otto I the Great. Thanks to him, a German knight, the bishops obtained great influence, acquired the rank of princes and provided spiritual knowledge, promoted crafts, trade and farming. Directed and protected by the Emperor, not by the Pope, the first cultural centers blossomed in Quedlinburg, Reichenau and Hersfeld. The Popes, on the other hand, had honorable men murdered; such Popes as Hadrian IV who ordered Arnold of Brescia to be strangled and burned when he heard of the latter's sermons of repen-

tance. It should be remarked in passing that the Popes had fixed sums paid them by the whore houses, which Paul I (1464-1471) had shaped into a permanent source of income. Sixtus IV drew 20,000 gold ducats yearly form the houses of pleasure. The clergy had to pay fixed taxes for their concubines, while the Vatican rewarded its officials with passes for the brothels. Sixtus IV even permitted paederasty for a fixed payment. Innocence VIII had 16 children of his own to feed. Alexander VI, however, declared that the Pope stood higher than the king, in the same way as man above the beasts. Therefore, he had a dozen Bishops and Cardinals who appeared dangerous to him, murdered. For 300,000 gold ducats Pope Alexander VI deposed the Jhem, the Turkish pretender to the throne, and with a clear conscience calmly gathered in the money of the "unbeliever," the Sultan. In 1501 Alexander VI named his daughter Lucrezia for a time as his representative.

Underlying the efforts of Otto I undoubtedly lay the idea of a German National Church which seemed to have died out with the vanished Aryan Goths. For the same reason, he stipulated that the clergy be chosen from landowners, but this also caused him to subordinate himself to the Papacy: the Romans had to swear not to elect a Pope without agreement of the Emperor. Otto III autocratically appointed two Popes. Similarly Heinrich III purged the Papacy. In the great dispute between Archbishop Willigris of Mainz against the anti-national Roman centralism, all German Bishops because of their consciously open rejection, found themselves in opposition to the Pope who finally had to give way. One was freer then in Germany than in 1870 and 1930!

However, the Papacy received a great strengthening from the Clunyians who wished to create an international structure dependent only on the Pope and above the State. This movement admittedly set as its goal a reform of the dissolute monastic system but very soon showed its un-Germanic spiritual outlook. The hitherto customary practices of penance against the sinful devilish flesh, upon which the Teutons had looked with laughter, were divested of their earlier clumsy form and transformed into a cunning martydom of the soul (forerunners, as it were, of Jesuitism). For stipulated parts of the Clunyian monasteries strict commands of silence existed, every gaiety of mind was forbidden, friendships not tolerated. Informing upon others was given the stamp of pious duty and those found guilty had to undergo dishonoring punishments. This unnatural form of discipline clearly originates from that Ligurian-Eastern race which, before the immigration of the Nordics, settled South-East France among other places. This trampling down of the soul, this inward self-

emasculation and lust for subjugation under alien demons and magical powers, however, shows us the spirit of the Roman Church as being in the closest, racially conditioned mutual alliance with all un-Aryan blood and decomposed populations. It is therefore also no accident that the "reforms" of the Clunyians immediately gained a foothold in the eastern racial parts of Lothringen (Lorraine). Archbishop Aribo of Mainz at once made a stand against this spiritual sickness and supported the power-conscious Konrad II. In the north the old blood stirred almost simultaneously: Bishop Adalbert von Wettin set a Germanic national church as his goal: the word "deutsch" became universal usage for the first time, German monks of the Roman Church sought for the still remaining, almost destroyed spiritual treasures of their people.

The German Emperor had lifted the Pope out of a swamp, restored the Church to honor and ennobled its servants. Roman Universalism, strengthened anew as a result, naturally utilized these forces and based itself—as usual—on proven forgeries in order to establish the rule of the Papacy over the Emperor as "willed by God" and to set Centralism against Episcopalism. This struggle was carried on by every conceivable means: subjects were incited against the Emperor, indeed the Church ban was announced against "Unapostolic" bishops. That was Rome's gratitude.

The longevitity of the Papacy has been praised with particular emphasis by Roman historical writers as proof of its "divine appointment." But anyone who knows that Rome has to thank the Emperors first and foremost for its position of power and solely the inner greatness of devout aristocratic spirits like Francis of Assisi, Albertus Magnus and Master Eckehart for its spiritual influence, will certainly have a different opinion about this. Besides, the permanence of an establishment is not a measure of its inner value. It is solely a question of the forces which have helped it to perpetuate itself. Egyptian culture was much older than the Roman Church; the Mandarin can record more known ancestors than the Pope; Lao-Tse and Confucius lived two thousand five hundred years ago and are still dominant today. The German-Roman Emperors only died out about a hundred years ago. The time approaches at which the Pope will also become what he should be: the head of the Italian national church (the disputes between nationalistic Fascism and the Vatican will, it is to be hoped, hasten this). The Papacy (irrespective of the fact that a number of really great men have also sat on the so-called chair of Peter) had to build up its rule on the prerequisite of spiritual slavery and racial decomposition of the Germanic-determined peoples. Out of the great free souls who even in the 11th to 14th centuries devoted themselves to Rome as an

idea holy to them, the Vatican created weapons of servitude. Since the strengthening of Jesuitism, since the Tridentine Council, "Rome" has remained under racially inferior influence and has become rigid. The unclean "moral theory" of Alfons the Holy of Liguori on the one side, the dishonorable activity of Jesuitism on the other, has resulted in the fact that since the suffocating of Meister Eckehart's religion, all really great European culture has sprung from an anti-Church spirit, ranging from Dante (who in 1864 was still expressly damned by the Papacy because, among other reasons, he had described Rome as a sewer) and Giotto to Copernicus and Luther; not to speak of German classical art and Nordic painting and music. Everything which a slavish mentality called "love" gathered under Rome, everything which strove for honor and freedom of soul, parted more and more consciously from the Roman spiritual world.

* * *

The Knights Order lost its importance in the 15th and 16th centuries. But the concept of honor which it cultivated, had awoken in other sections of the people. The townsman commoner freed himself from the dominance of the castle, built his cities and churches, carried on commerce and trade and joined together into powerful leagues, until finally the Thirty Years War ended an entire culture.

It is demonstrated by the Hansa that the Germanic concept of honor was embodied even in the merchant whenever the latter relied upon himself and could operate without Oriental middlemen. Originally a modest merchants league with the purpose of safeguarding trade, the Hansa later stretched its arms out far, not only traded, but built, founded and colonized. The ruins of Novgorod and Wisby speak an equally loud language of moral power as the Rathauser of Bruges, Lubeck and Bremen. Over 75 cities formed a protective league which, according to its innermost nature, had the task of forming a center of German power against Imperial impotence. But before other similar ideas could take deeper root, the greatest catastrophe of German history intruded. And with the same consequences as had been shown by the Huguenot wars in France: the character of the German people was altered. If Germany at the beginning of the 16th century, in spite of the weak Imperial rule, possessed a proud peasantry and a prosperous burgher class, then thirty bloody years (which still did not satisfy Pope Innocence X) exterminanted the best blood of Germany, numerous hordes of alien race from foreign states destroyed the native stock, a whole generation grew up in the midst

of robbery and murder. Bavaria alone recorded 5000 abandoned farmsteads, hundreds of flourishing cities lay in ruins, nearly two-thirds of the German people were annihilated. There no longer existed any art, any culture, any character. Dishonorable princes plundered a wretched people and these "subjects" dully and stupidly allowed everything to happen to them. And yet despite all, Germanic blood stirred itself against the ruination from the Habsburgs and the French threat. The blood of the Lower Saxons which had once advanced to the Duna demonstrated resistance to total decline above and below. Like a promising cry the trumpets of Fehrbellin still resound in our ears today and the voice of the great Elector with whose deeds Germany's recovery, salvation and re-birth, had their beginning. One may criticize Prussia however much one likes, but this decisive salvation of the Germanic substance remains forever its deed of renown; without it there would exist no German culture, in fact no real German people, at best millions defenceless to looting by neighbors lusting for booty and by the avaricious princes of the Church.

It is no accident of chance, if today in the midst of a terrible new fall into the abyss, the figure of Frederick the Great appears particularly invested with radiant glory, that in him there are concentrated—in spite also of his human sides—all those values of character for whose predominance the best Germans struggle hopefully today, namely, personal boldness, ruthless power of decision, consciousness of responsibility, penetrating cleverness and an awareness of honor such as had never before been chosen with such mythic greatness as the guiding star of an entire life. "How can a prince outlive his State, the fame of his people and his own honor?" he asks of his sister on September 17, 1757. Misfortune will never make him cowardly, on the contrary: "I will never accept disgrace. The honor which in war made me place my life at stake a hundred times, has allowed me to defy death as an event of lesser importance." He goes on to emphasize: "One will not be able to say of me, that I have outlived the freedom of my fatherland or the greatness of my house." "If I had more than one life, I would sacrifice it for the fatherland," writes Frederick on August 16, 1759 after a terrible defeat, "I do not think of fame, but of the State." "My inalterable loyalty towards the fatherland and honor allow me to undertake everything, although hope does not guide me," are his words a few days later. To Luise Dorothea von Gotha he also makes the avowal: "Perhaps Prussia's hour of destiny has come, perhaps one will experience a new despotic Emperorship. I do not know. But I vouch for the fact that it will only come to that after streams of blood have flowed and that I will not look upon my

fatherland in chains and at Germans in the most disgraceful slavery." And Frederick writes anew to d'Argens: "You should know that it is not necessary that I live but certainly that I do my duty" and "Never will I experience the moment which would compel me to conclude a disadvantageous peace." "I will either allow myself to be buried under the ruins of my fatherland or. . .make an end to my life myself. . .I have allowed myself to be guided by this inner voice and by the demands of honor and I also intend doing this in the future."

If Frederick Wilhelm I was the symbol of civic honorableness and self-limiting diplomacy, then Frederick II was the symbol of everything heroic which appeared forgotten and vanished in blood, dirt and misery. His life is the truest, greatest German history and any German who attempts to falsify with malicious gloss the figure of Friedericus must appear to us today as a most despicable rascal.

But it was only a few whom he managed to influence. In spite of his great work for peace, the broad layers of the people were crude, without cultural tradition, the educated were decadent, foppish, un-Prussian, un-German. They only allowed the disciplining forms of Frederick to take effect upon them against their will and Frederick himself—to whose government Kant had dedicated his *Critique of Pure Reason*—found no intellectual independence within the Germans of his day compared with the French, so that his love for French literature also laid the way for the victory of the new French world of thought which in its version of "love" in the form of the teaching of Humanitarianism, crippled the organic powers of Prussia which had still not awoken to full consciousness and later made it incapable of resisting the armies of the French revolution.

This new doctrine of humanitarianism was the "religion" of the Freemasons. The latter has provided up to the present the spiritual foundations of an abstract universalistic culture, the starting point of all self-seeking sermons promising bliss. It also gave (around 1740) the stamp to the political slogans of the last 150 years: "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity," and gave birth to chaotic, race-decomposing "humane" democracy.

At the beginning of the 18th century men gathered at an assembly in London whose conflict with the former "religion of love" had led in many cases to their exile from people and fatherland, and who in the midst of a dissolute time founded a "League of mankind for the promotion of humanity and brotherhood." Since this league recognized only "mankind," no racial or religious difference was made from the start. "Mason-

ry is a humanitarian league for the spreading of tolerant and humane principles, in the striving for which the Jew and Turk can have as great a share as a Christian." So ran the Constitution set up in 1722. The idea of humanitarianism was to form "the principle, the purpose and the substance" of Freemasonry. "It is"—according to the Freiburg Ritual—"more far-reaching than all Churches, States and schools, than all classes, peoples and nationalities; for it extends over the whole of mankind." The German Lodge teaches us the same even today. The Roman Church and the Freemasonic Anti-Church are thus united in tearing down all barriers which have been erected by spiritual and physical forms. Both call upon their supporters in the name of love or humanity, in the name of a boundless universalism, except that the Church demands complete subjection, subordination within its domain (which naturally is to be the entire earth) while the Anti-Church preaches an unrestricted destruction of frontiers, makes the suffering and joy of the individual "man" into the measure of its judgement, which must be regarded as the cause of the present situation, namely, that the material well-being of the individual has become the highest good for democracy and receives the first place from it in the life of society.

This disintegrating view of the world was and is the prerequisite for the political teaching of democracy and of the coercive dogma of the necessity of the free interplay of forces. Thus all the forces which work for the loosening of State, national and social bonds, necessarily made effort to render themselves of service to this philosophy of Freemansonry, consequently also the "League of Mankind." Here we see International Jewry worming its way from instinct coupled with conscious reflection into the organization of Freemasonry. Admittedly, the racial essence in the "League of Mankind" reacted just as defensively against the attempt by the Church to exterminate Germanic nature but it is nevertheless easily proved that, while Nordic man defended himself against Rome, the blind Hodur unwittingly gave him the death blow from behind. Freemasonry in Italy, France and England, became a political league of men and led the Democratic revolutions of the 19th century. Year by year its "world outlook" undermined the bases of all Germanic nature. Today we see the busy representatives of the International Stock Exchange and of world trade moving almost everywhere behind the leadership of the "Anti-Church." All in the name of "humanitarianism." The hypocrisy of the present-day exploiters of "humanity" is without question more degrading than those attempts at slavery which in the name of "Christian love" have so often plunged Europe into unrest and chaos. Thanks to the

preaching of "humanitarianism" and the doctrine of human equality every Jew, Negro and Mulatto can become a citizen of equal rights in a European State; thanks to the humanitarian concern for the individual there are hosts of luxury institutions for the incurably sick and insane in European States; thanks to humanitarianism the confirmed criminal is regarded as merely an unfortunate without any concern for the interests of the people as a whole, is let loose again into society at the first opportunity and not hindered in his capacity of reproduction. In the name of "humanity" and "freedom of spirit" the pornographic journalist and every dishonorable scoundrel is allowed to trade in every imaginable brothel literature; thanks to "humanity" Negroes and Jews may marry into the Nordic race, indeed even occupy important offices. This "humanitarianism" unconnected with any racial concept of honor, has among others, made the indescribably corrupt system of stock exchange swindling into a respected profession; indeed this organized band of criminals in frockcoats and tophats today decides at world trade and "expert" conferences veritably autocratically over the fate of millions of hard-working people.

In the wake of this Freemasonic democracy swan the entire Marxist movement falsified the beginnings of a healthy protest by the workers and controlled all Social-Democratic parties in the service of the stock exchange with aid of Jewish finance, Jewish leaders and the Jewish, partly individualistic, partly universalistic, "ideology." The industrial worker of the 19th century, cheated of his destiny, suddenly uprooted, robbed of all balanced judgement, fled to the alluring preachments of a proletarian International, believed that by class struggle, i.e. by destruction of half his own body, he would be able to become "free," intoxicated himself on the power attained and poured over this the whitewash of humanism. Today this delusion has burst and the Marxist leadership has been unmasked as perpetrating a frightful swindle of a hard struggling class. (See A. Rosenberg: *Die Internationale Hochfinanz als Herrin der Arbeiterbewegung in allen Landern,* Munich 1925).

The paradox both of democracy as well as of Marxist doctrine consists in that they both in actuality represent the most brutal, dishonorable materialistic view of the world and consciously foster all impulses which will aid decomposition, but at the same time give assurances of their mercifulness, their love for the subjected and exploited. In a clever way the spiritual readiness for the sacrifice of the proletariat is called upon, to make the latter inwardly dependent on its leaders. We see in Marxism the idea of sacrifice and of "love" playing the same role as in the Roman

Catholic system. Blood and honor were likewise mocked and derided by the leaders of Marxism until, however, these indestructible ideas nevertheless revealed themselves in the workers. Today there is at last talk of "proletarian honor." If this idea spreads, then everything is still not lost, for with the holding aloft of the idea of honor in general the German working class will also know how to rid itself once and for all of its Marxist leadership. If this idea of class honor then takes shape into that of national honor, then German freedom will be secured as a result. But this is only possible when all the real workers of the German people form a front against all those who have sold themselves to trade, profit and the stock exchange, irrespective of whether this fact is covered with the cloak of Democracy, Christianity, Internationalism or "Humanitarianism."

The spirit of Frederick the Great takes effect today on the German people like an unyielding natural force. Everything which re-discovered itself amidst the confusion of triumphing sub-humanity, saw its highest striving embodied in the struggle for freedom conducted by "old Fritz," as if a bronzen pen has outlined Germanic nature in advance through all veils of time. But then, alongside this greatness occurred the incomprehensible tragedy that the spiritual freedom possible to a great man became limited to small possessions and his spirit which had striven to shape itself by a terrible but necessary discipline, was driven into the arms of French democracy brilliant with outward show. Napoleon encountered a Prussia given over to bewigged ostentation and outward show. The latter collapsed because he no longer thought in the manner of Frederick, but as pacifist-liberalistic. "We have fallen asleep on the laurels of Frederick the Great," wrote Queen Luise later to her father. But from this defeat there finally arose the idea of a United Germany, Prussia's honor became Germany's concern. Gneisenau and Blucher, Scharnhorst and Jahn, Arndt and Stein, were all the embodiment of the old concept of honor. They have also expressed this all their life long like Queen Luise herself who wished to do everything to ease the lot of her people, except what went against her feeling of honor.

We know all this or should, in the same way as the student bodies who unrolled their banners and climbed the barricades later, when peruque and subservient spirit—those eternally unblessed consequences of the Thirty Years War, still dominant today—had cheated Germany of its supreme efforts during the War of Liberation, until the dream of Germans then apparently found fulfilment on the battlefields of Metz, Mars-la-Tour, St. Privat and Sedan. For the Versailles of 1871 was a political agreement devoid of any mythical outlook on the world. The uncondition-

ality of the great German idea which made Blucher declare that if kings did not wish the elevation of their people, then they should be driven out; which occasioned Stein to put before the king of Prussia the choice of either signing the proclamation "To My People," or going to Spandau; this unconditionality was lacking in the generation after 1871. The latter gave itself up to "economics," to world trade, became Freemasonic-Humanistic, became "sated," forgot the task of enlarging its living space and collapsed, disintegrated by Democracy, Marxism and Humitarianism. Only today has the hour of rebirth come.

* * *

The Humility of the Christian Church and Freemasonic "Humanitarianism" were two forms by which the idea of love was preached as the highest value to human groups which were to be directed from some ambitious center of power. The fact that many teachers of Christian Humility as well as Liberal Humanism had no such intention did not play any role at all; it is merely a question of how the value proclaimed was utilized. At the end of the 19th century the idea of love appeared in a third form which was presented to us by Bolshevism: in the Russian doctrine of suffering and sympathy, symbolized in the "Dostoevskian man."

In his "Diary" Dostoevski speaks quite openly of an "absolute, deeply-rooted longing," among Russians, the longing for suffering, for continual suffering; suffering in everything, even in enjoyment. On the basis of this his characters act and live. Therefore in sympathy also lies the strong-point of Russian morality. The people know that a criminal acts sinfully, but: "There are unexpressed ideas. . .the description of a criminal as an unfortunate must be included in these ideas which are inherent in the Russian people. This idea is a purely Russian one."

Dostoevski is the magnifying glass of the Russian soul; through his personality one can read the whole of Russia in its often incomprehensible diversity. In fact, the conclusions which he draws from his confession of belief are just as characteristic as his reflections when judging the condition of the Russian soul. He remarked that this idea of suffering is closely linked with traits of the impersonal and subjected. The Russian suicide, for example, has not the shadow of doubt that the self to be killed could be an immortal one. At the same time, he is not an atheist in any way. He has apparently heard nothing at all about this: "Consider the earlier atheists, when they had lost faith in one thing, they immediately began to

believe passionately in another. Consider the beliefs of Diderot, Voltaire. . .completely *tabula rasa* with ours; indeed, and why make mention of Voltaire here? There is simply a lack of money to keep a lover to himself, and nothing more."

To find this recognition existing in a man who "only wished to live to one day see his people happy and educated," is alarming and is made greater by Dostoevski's remark that in Russia there is no one who does not tell lies. In fact, the most honorable people of all can lie. First of all, because truth seems to bore a Russian; but secondly, "because we are all ashamed of ourselves, and each makes efforts to unconditionally show himself as something other than he is." And despite all longing for knowledge and truth the Russian is nevertheless badly equipped. But here the reverse side of subjugation is revealed: unbounded arrogance.

> "He (the Russian) perhaps understands nothing at all about the questions which he undertakes to solve, but he does not feel ashamed and his conscience is calm. This lack of conscience gives proof of such an indifference in relation to self-criticism, of such a lack of self-respect, that one falls into despair and loses hope of the nation ever possessing anything independent or bringing salvation."

Lieutenant Pirogow, in full uniform, is struck by a German on the street. After he has made sure that no one could have witnessed the incident, Pirogow flees into a side alley, in order as hero of the salon to make a proposal of marriage that same evening to an aristocratic lady. The latter knew nothing about the cowardice of her lover. "Do you believe that she would have accepted him if she had known?" "She would have done so unconditionally."

Several Russians are travelling in a railway train with Justus von Liebig, the great chemist who, however, is recognized by none of them. One of them who understands nothing about chemistry begins to talk with Liebig on this subject. He talks beautifully and at length until reaching his station when he takes his luggage and leaves the compartment proudly and enormously satisfied with himself. But the other Russians never doubted for a moment that the charlatan had triumphed in the debate.

Dostoevski attributes this self-abasement (linked with sudden arrogance) to the cultivation over two hundred years of a total lack of self-reliance and to constant spitting into the Russian face during a similar period which brought the Russian conscience into catastrophic subjection. Today we are forced to make another judgement, that there is something unhealthy, sick, bastardized in Russian blood, which again and again

frustrates all attempts to reach the heights. Psychologism is not the consequence of a strong spiritual life, but exactly the opposite, a sign of a crippling of soul. Just as a wounded man will again and again feel and look at his wound, so a man sick of soul will examine his inner conditions. In the Russian idea of suffering and subjection the most powerful tension exists between the values of love and honor. In the entire West the idea of honor and freedom broke through again and again, in spite of burnings at the stake and Papal interdicts. With the "Russian man," such as he became almost a prophet around the turn of the 20th century—not the slightest role is played by honor as a formative power. Mitya Karamasov who kicks and illtreats his father, abasing himself again afterwards, is not familiar with the idea, nor the brooding Ivan, nor Stara Sossima (one of the most beautiful figures of Russian literature), not to mention old Karamasov himself. Prince Myshkin plays the sick idiotic role of a man devoid of personality to conclusion with shattering power. Ragoshin is of dissolute passion, a European backbone is also lacking to him. Raskolnikov is inwardly unbalanced, Smerdyakov finally the concentration of everything slavish, devoid of upward longing. To the latter are joined all those gesticulating students and sick revolutionaries who talk with one another entire nights long, debate without knowing in the end about what they actually argued. These are allegories of a sick blood, of a poisoned soul.

Once Turgenev looked around in Russia for a model of power and uprightness for the hero of a novel. He found no one suitable and chose a Bulgarian whom he called Insarov. Gorki descended to the dregs of society, described the tramp devoid of will, without faith, or at most only with such as glimmered like the glow of phosphorus in rotten wood. Andreyev created the man who received boxes on the ear, and as men they all confirm the bitter recognition by Shaadayev, that Russia belongs neither to the West nor to the East, that it is not governed by an organically strong tradition of its own. The Russian is a world exception in that he has not introduced a single new idea into the multitude produced by mankind and everything which he has received of progress has been distorted by him. The Russian admittedly moves, but on a crooked line, which does not lead to any goal, and he is like a small child which cannot think correctly.

As elaborated, this recognition also slumbered in Dostoevski, the lack of personality consciousness had clearly been recognized by him. But the torment of longing to nevertheless present the world with something original sprang from his idea of "universal mankind," which was appar-

ently to be regarded as synonymous with Russia. It is Russia which has preserved in its bosom the true image of Christ, with the ultimate destiny, when the peoples of the West have lost the way, of revealing a new path of salvation to them. Suffering, sorrowing mankind is a prophecy for the coming "message" of Russia.

Today it is clear, that Dostoevski's despairing attempt fundamentally resembles the behavior of the Russian whom he had placed opposite to Justus von Liebig; a broken soul, devoid of personality, who arrogates to himself conquerer of the world.

Dostoevski had success spiritually among all Europeans who had fallen into a tired weariness, with all bastards of the great city and—disregarding his anti-Semitic outlook—with the Jewish literary world, which saw in his characters and in Tolstoy's barren Pacifism a further welcome means for the disintegration of the West. The artistic power of Dostoevsky is not under debate here (see in this connection the Second Book) but the characters as such, which he created, and the accompanying environment. From now on, everything which was sick, broken and decayed was held to be "human." The humbled and persecuted became "heroes," epileptics were represented as being problems of deep concern to mankind, as unassailable like the decaying holy beggars of the Middle Ages or Simon Stylites. By this the conception of Germanic man was transformed into its opposite. What the West regards as *human* is a hero like Achilles or the creative struggling Faust; human is a power like the untiring Leonardo; human is a struggle such as Richard Wagner and Frederick the Great embodied. A clearing out must be performed once and for all of this Russian disease of representing criminals as unfortunates and rotten decayed men as symbols of "humanity." Even the Indian, upon whom many Russians call in a false way, accepts his fate as self-guilt, as guilt from an earlier life. In whatever manner one interprets this Indian doctrine of the migration of souls, it is aristocratic and once originated from a courageous heart. But Dostoevskyan lamentation about "the power of darkness" is the helpless stammering of a poisoned blood. This decayed blood created its highest "value" in the longing for suffering, in humility, "universal human love," and become hostile to nature, as triumphant Rome once did, until Europe managed to a certain extent to shake off this ascetic Egypto-African masochism.

It is ill-fated that today ancient Greek love is described by the same word in so-called Christian teaching and Dostoevski and Plato are even mentioned in the same breath. The Eros of Greece was a spiritual exhuberance, linked always with creative feeling for Nature and the Divine

Plato is a completely different figure from that presented to us by theologians and professors. From Homer to Plato, Nature and Love have been one, just as the highest art in Hellas remained racially connected. But Church "love" set itself up not only against all ideas of race and people, but it even went beyond this. Zeno the "Holy" said in the fourth century B.C.: "The greatest renown of Christian virtue is to trample with the feet upon Nature." The Church has faithfully followed this dogma wherever it could assert it. The insulting of the body as unclean has lasted uninterrupted into our days, when Nationalism and the racial idea are combated as pagan. The "Imitation of Jesus"—to attain which the devout rolled themselves in ashes, beat themselves with whips, went about in pus and sores, loaded themselves with iron chains, sat on a pillar for thirty years like Simon Stylites or, like Holy Thalelaeus, spent ten years clamped inside a wagon wheel, to pass the remainder of his "life" in a narrow cage—all this was a parallel to the abstract "Good" of Socrates and to later "Dostoevskian man."

It is not unnatural "Love," not an unrealizable "Community of the good and faithful," not a "Universal humanity" with decomposed blood, which has always had a creative effect in culture and art, but—as in Hellas, fruitful Eros and racial beauty, in Germania honor and the dynamic of race. Whoever disregards these laws is incapable of showing the way to a strong future for the Germanic West.

With Dostoevski one can virtually touch with the hand his great holy will in its constant struggle with the forces of decline. While he praises Russian man as the signpost of the European future, he already sees Russia delivered up to demons. He knows in advance who will be master in the play of forces: "Unemployed lawyers and insolent Jews." Kerensky and Trotsky are predicted. In the year 1917, "Russian Man" finally disintegrated. He fell into two parts. The Nordic-Russian blood gave up the struggle, the Eastern-Mongolian powerfully stirred up, summoned Chinese and desert peoples to its aid, Jews and Armenians pushed forward to leadership, and the Kalmuch-Tartar Lenin became master. The demonry of this blood directed itself instinctively against everything which outwardly still had some honest effect, looked manly and Nordic, like a living reproach against a type of man whom Lothrop Stoddard rightly described as the "Underman." Out of the impotent love of earlier grew an epileptic attack, carried through politically with all the energy of the insane. Smerdyakov ruled over Russia. Irrespective of in whatever way the Russian experiment may develop, Bolshevism as ruler has only been possible as the consequence of a racially and spiritually sick national

body which could not decide in favor of honor but only of bloodless "Love." Whoever desires a new Germany, will, as a result, also reject the Russian temptation from himself along with its Jewish manipulation. The turning-away from the latter is already occurring. The future will record the results.

When the World War broke out, the leading men of national outlook in Germany who were afflicted with sickness, did not recognize destiny as consisting either in the honor and freedom of the people or in "love" but in trade. This poisoning necessarily led to a crisis, to a bursting of the swollen pus. This occured on November 9, 1918. The ensuing times proved that all the old parties and their leaders were rotten, useless for a new structure of our State. They were forced to talk of the people and yet thought only of economics; they spoke of the unity of the Reich and yet thought of profits; they carried on "Christian politics" and diligently feathered their own nests. The spiritual and political situation of our times is therefore the following:

The old Syrian-Jewish-Eastern Church system has dethroned itself: starting from a dogma which did not correspond to the laws of spiritual structure of the Nordic West, in the effort to push to one side the culture-carrying and creating ideas of the Nordic race—honor, freedom and duty—or to become evangelistic, this process of poisoning has led many times to the gravest disasters. Today we recognize that the highest central values of the Roman and Protestant Churches, as a negative form of Christianity, do not correspond to our soul, that they stand in the way of the organic powers of the peoples determined by the Nordic race, that they have to make way for the latter, must allow themselves to be revalued in the sense of a Germanic Christianity. This is the meaning of the present search after religious truth.

The old Nationalism is dead. Once, in 1813, it flared up, but since then it has more and more forfeited its unconditional nature, it became poisoned by bureaucratic dynasticism, industrial politics, stock exchange profit economy, typified, thanks to humanitarian stupidity, in the idealless townsman of the nineteenth century and finally collapsed on November 9, 1918, when its supporters and representatives ran away before a few hordes of deserters and jailbirds.

III. Mysticism and Action

The concept of honor with its diverse ties in the earth can be found embodied in the lives of the Nordic Viking, the Teutonic knight, the Prussian officer, the Baltic Hansa, the German soldier and the German peasant. Together with inner freedom it is the most important life-shaping law. This motif of honor appears as the spiritual base in poetic art from the ancient epics onward, from Walther von der Vogelweide and the knight's songs to Kleist and Goethe. But there is still another fine branch on which we can follow the working of Nordic honor and that is in the German mystic.

The mystic releases himself more and more from the entanglements of the material world. He recognizes that the impulsive aspects of our existence, such as pleasure and power, or even so-called good works, are not essential for the welfare of the soul. The more he overcomes earthly bonds all the greater, richer and more godlike does he feel himself inwardly become. He discovers a purely spiritual power and feels that his soul represents a center of strength to which nothing can be compared. Such freedom and serenity of soul toward everything, even in the face of God, reveals the profoundest depths into which we can follow the Nordic concepts of honor and freedom. It is "that mighty fortress of the soul," that "spark" of which Meister Eckehart speaks again and again with

awed admiration; it represents the most inward, the most sensitive and yet the strongest essence of our race and culture. Eckehart does not give this innermost essence a name since the pure subject of perceiving and willing must be nameless, without essence and separated from all forms of time and space. However, today we may venture to describe this "spark" as representing the metaphysical allegory of the ideas of honor and freedom. In the last analysis, honor and freedom are not external qualities but spiritual essences independent of time and space forming the 'fortress' from which the real will and reason undertake their sorties into 'the world.'

Before it could fully blossom, the joyous message of German mysticism was strangled by the anti-European church with all the means in its power. Nevertheless, the message has never died. The great sin of Protestantism has been that instead of listening to the former, it made the so-called Old Testament into a folk book and interpreted the Jewish texts literally. The present period of renewed spiritual readiness will either listen to the message of German mysticism or end up under the feet of the old forces before it has had time to unfold like many past attempts at a transformation from Roman-Jewish poisoning. A will, hard as steel, must today be joined to that "illuminated mind and elevated spirit" which Master Eckehart demanded of his followers and which is courageous enough to draw all proper conclusions from its avowal: "If you wish to have the kernel, then you must break the shell."

It has been six hundred years since the greatest apostle of the Nordic West gave us our religion, devoting a full life to ridding our being and becoming of poison: to overcoming the Syrian dogma that enslaves body and soul and which awakens the God within our own bosom; the "Kingdom of Heaven within us."

In the search for a new spiritual link with the past, there are those among the present day movement for renewal in Germany who wish to go back to the *Edda* and the cycle of Germanic ideas related to it. It is thanks to them that, along-side that which is purely fabulous, the inner richness of our sagas and folk tales has again become visible from under the rubble and ashes left by the fires of the stake. But, in pursuing this longing to find inner substance with past generations and their religious allegories, the German faith overlooks that Wotan (Wodan, Odin) is dead as a religious form. He did not die at the hands of Bonifacius, but of himself. He completed the decline of the gods during a mythological epoch, a time of serene nature. His fall was already foreseen in the Nordic poems, although hopes were expressed for the coming of the 'strong one from

above,' in presentment of the unavoidable twilight of the gods. In place of this, however, to the misfortune of Europe, the Syrian Jehovah appeared in the shape of his "representative"; the Etruscan-Roman Pope. Odin was and is dead; but the German mystic discovered the 'strong one from above' in his own soul. The Valhalla of the gods descended from misty infinity into the breasts of men. The discovery and preaching of the indestructible freedom of soul was an act of salvation which has protected us up to the present against all attempts at strangulation. The religious history of the West is therefore almost exclusively the history of inter-denominational upheavals. True religion within the church only existed insofar as the Nordic soul could not be hindered from unfolding (as for instance with Saint Francis and Fra Angelico) when its echo in Western man was too powerful.

The reborn German man appeared on the scene for the first time consciously in the German mystic, even if in the garb of his day. The spiritual birth of our culture was not perfected at the time of the so-called Renaissance or during the Reformation—the latter period was more one of outward collapse and desparate struggles—but in the 13th and 14th century when the idea of the spiritual personality became for the first time the supporting idea of our history, religion and philosophy of life. In this period the essence of our later critical philosophy was also consciously anticipated. In addition, the eternal, metaphysical creed of the Nordic West proclaimed that which had effect on the souls of many ensuing generations but could not generally manifest itself until the time was ripe.

More than three hundred years had to pass until the name of Christ signified anything for the peoples of the Mediterranean; about a thousand had to pass until the entire West was permeated by it. Confucius died, mourned only by a few; his worship began three hundred years after his death. Five hundred years passed before the first temple was built to him. Today, prayers are uttered to Confucius as the "Perfected Holy One." Six hundred years also had to pass over the grave of Master Eckehart before the German soul could understand him. But, today, a revelation seems to spread through the people like the light of dawn, as if the time had come for the apostle of the German, the "holy and blessed master."

* * *

Every creature pursues its life with an aim even if it be unknown to it. The human soul also has a destiny, that is, to arrive at a pure knowledge

of itself and a consciousness of God. But this soul is "scattered and spread out" in the world of the senses, of space and time. The senses are active in it and weaken—at first—the power of spiritual concentration. The pre-condition of "inner workings" is, therefore, the withdrawal of all exterior powers, the extinguishing of all images and allegories. These "inner workings" are meant to "draw Heaven to oneself," as Jesus is said to have testified and demanded of the "powerful" of soul. This attempt by the mystic thus demands the exclusion of the world as Idea, in order to become, where possible, conscious, as pure subject, of the metaphysical essence which lives within us. Since this is not completely possible, the idea of "God" is created as a new object of this soul in order ultimately to announce the identical value of soul and God.

However, this act is only possible under the prerequisite of spiritual freedom from all dogmas, churches and popes. Master Eckehart, the Dominican priest, does not shy away from joyfully and openly proclaiming this fundamental creed of every truly Aryan nature. During the course of a long life, he speaks about the "light of the soul" as being "without origin and uncreated," and preaches that "God has placed the soul in free self-determination, so that he wishes nothing of it beyond its free will nor expects of it what it does not wish." He goes on to oppose the dogma of "conformist faith" by declaring that there are three things which prove the "nobility of the soul." The first relates to the glory of the Creature (of "Heaven"); the second mighty strength; and third, "the fruitfullness of its works." Before each "going forth" into the world the soul must have been conscious of "its own beauty." The inward work of gaining the kingdom of heaven, however, can only be perfected through freedom.

> "Thy soul will bear no fruit until thou hast accomplished thy task, and neither God nor thyself will abandon these if thou hast brought thine into the world. Otherwise, thou wilt have no peace and thou wilt bear no fruit. And even then, it is still disquieting enough because it is born of a soul which is bound (to the outside world) and whose tasks are controlled, not from a soul born in freedom."

If the question arises why God became man at all, then the heretical Eckehart does not answer: "In order that we wretched sinners can record a superfluity of good works." But he says:

> "I answer that it is for the reason that God might be born in the soul . . . upon which a joyous credo follows: The soul in which God is to be born, must have forsaken time and time have forsaken it, must fly upward and stand completely strong in the kingdom of God; that

> is width and breadth, yet which is neither wide nor broad. There the soul recognizes all things and recognizes them in their completeness. The Masters, whatever they write about how wide heaven is, I say that the smallest power which there is in my soul, is wider than all the expense of heaven!"

The current exposition of mysticism repeatedly emphasizes only the "giving up of self," the throwing away of oneself to God, and sees in this abandonment of the essence of mystical experience. This viewpoint is understandable when one knows it arises from the late-mysticism falsified by Rome and that it originates from the seemingly ineradicable assumption that Self and God are different in essence. But whoever has understood Eckehart will have no difficulty in establishing that his "abandonment" is in reality the highest self-consciousness which cannot, however, be recognized in this world other than through an antithesis in time and space. The doctrine of freedom of the soul is one of freedom from God. The doctrine of "detachment" signifies the utter rejection of the Old Testament and its ideas, along with the sickly-sweet pseudo-mysticism of later times.

These words about the capacity of the soul for unlimited expansion are true mystical experience. Simultaneously, they signify the philosophical recognition of the ideality of space, time and casuality which Eckehart also asserts in other passages, proving and teaching in even more beautiful language than Kant (who was heavily burdened with natural science and philosophical scholasticism) was able to do four hundred years later.

> "Heaven is pure and of untroubled clarity; it is touched neither by time nor space. Nothing corporeal has its place therein and it is also not included in time; its transmutation occurs with incredible quickness. Its course is itself timeless but from its course comes time. Nothing hinders the soul so much in knowing God, as time and space. Thus, if the soul is to perceive God at all, then it perceives him beyond and above space . . . If the eye is to observe color, then it must first be divested of all colors. If the soul is to see God then it must have nothing in common with nothingness. God, as the positive expression of religious man, is in the philosophical term the "thing in itself."

It is grasped with the deepest reflection, not only as distinct from impulse and image (as a result of which all nature symbolism is destroyed). In another passage Eckehart says:

> "Everything which has existence in time and space does not belong to God . . . the soul is complete and indivisible simultaneously in

> foot and in eye and in every limb . . . The ever-present now in which God has made the world, the now in which I speak at this moment, is exactly as close as yesterday. And even the day of judgement is exactly as close to him in eternity as yesterday."

A free spirit like Eckehart must necessarily draw the conclusion—hostile to the church teaching—that death is not the wages of sin as theologians who aim to put us in fear assert, but a natural and fundamentally unimportant event by which our eternal being—which was before and will be afterwards—is in no way touched. With a splendid gesture Eckehart calls to the world:

> "I am my own Self's cause, according to my eternal and temporal nature. Only on this account am I born. According to my eternal manner of birth I have been here from eternity and am and will remain eternally. Only what I am as a temporal creature will die and become nothing for it belongs to the day, therefore it must, like time, vanish. In my birth all things were also born, I was simultaneously my own and all things' cause. And if I wished neither I nor anything else would be. And if I were not, neither would God be."

And boldly he adds:

> "That one understand this, is not demanded."

Never before, not even in India, has there been such a consciously aristocratic spiritual creed that can be compared to that which Eckehart laid down. Yet he was fully aware that he would not be understood by the age in which he lived. Each of his words was an affront to the Roman church. His words were perceived as such. As the most celebrated preacher in Germany, he was dragged before the Inquistion. The church, fearing his followers, could not do away with him as it did with other, lesser heretics. But when Eckehart was dead, the Church was again able to preach its "infallible" anathema over even the profoundest German soul. But his teachings have lasted and have exercised a profound influence over the German soul and in German history.

From the unerring consciousness of the freedom of a "noble man" and of a "noble soul" there results a condemnation of so-called good works. These are no magical expedients such as Rome teaches, no credit which is booked with Jehovah, but merely a means of binding the impulsive world of the senses. "A rein," so Eckehart teaches, "must be laid upon the outer man to prevent him running away from himself." A man should perform devout exercises, not merely to do something good for himself

but because he honors truth. "If a man finds himself given up to true inwardness," preaches the German apostle, "then he boldly lets all outwardness fall, even if it be exercises to which he might have bound himself by oath, from which neither Pope nor bishop could grant release! For no one can take from him an oath which has been made to God." To my knowledge this is the only passage in which Eckehart openly speaks aggressively of the Pope. But it shows his complete and self-reliant rejection of the fundamental laws of the Roman church.

This human greatness, uplifting all things, finds its hostile counterpart in priestly arrogance. One of the greatest orators of the 13th century, the lay brother Berthold von Regensburg, in other respects an interesting man, taught that if he saw the Virgin Mary alongside the heavenly hosts and a priest also present then he would fall down before the latter rather than the former. "If a priest came to where my dear Lady Holy Mary and all the Heavenly Host sat, they would all stand up before the priest. . ." Further: "Whoever truly receives dedication as a priest, has a power reaching so far and wide that emperor and king never possessed such great power. . .Whoever makes himself subject to the power of the priest—even if he has committed a great sin—then the priest has the power to at once close Hell to him and to open up Heaven. . ."

What is this but the most utter Syrian sorcery in which we have been enveloped?

According to Eckehart the "noble soul" of a man turned toward the Eternal is the representative of God upon earth, not the Church, Bishop or Pope. "No one here on earth possesses the right to bind or release me—even less the right to do this 'as God's representative'." These words which every devout man of the Aryan family of peoples could proclaim as his own creed are naturally born of a completely different substance than the 'medicine man' philosophy which Rome has fabricated for its own use and whose dogmas all follow only the one aim of making mankind dependent on the Roman priest caste and to root out any 'nobility of soul'. In his sermon on the first epistle of John 4:9, Eckehart says:

> I assert decisively that as long as you do your works for the sake of Heaven, of God or for your own blessedness, thus outwardly, then you are not really on the right path . . . Whoever imagines that by contemplation, devotion, ecstatic feelings and gross flattery he has more of God than at the fireside or in the cow stall, does the same thing as one who takes God and wraps a cloak around his head and pushes him under a bench. If one asked an honest man who works

> on a firm foundation: 'Why are you performing your works' Then he would merely say, if he spoke properly, 'I perform them to have effect!'

The teaching of the righteousness of works is regarded by Eckehart as a veritable whispering in the ear by the Devil and, as far as prayer is conerned, he makes a popular appeal:

> The people often say to me: 'Pray to God for us!' Whereupon I think to myself, 'Why do you even go out? Why do you not remain with yourself and reach down into your own treasure?' In fact you carry all reality within you according to your nature. So that we must thus remain in ourselves—as the creatures we are—and possess all reality of our own, without mediation and diversity in real blessedness and may God help us to do this.

Eckehart is thus a priest who would like to see the priesthood abolished; who would like to adjust his entire activity solely towards liberating the way for the man who seeks; who is regarded by him as essentially an equal and of equal birth; who will not enslave the soul by persuading it to eternal dependency upon Pope and church, but who wishes to bring its slumbering beauty, its nobility and its freedom into consciousness, that is, wishes to awaken its awareness of honor. For, in the last analysis, honor is nothing other than the free, beautiful and noble soul.

This same striving to elevate man is perceptible when Eckehart rejects the doctrine of human weakness: "Therefore man can certainly imitate our Lord, according to the measure of his weakness and needs, and indeed, may not believe he cannot attain this." Once more, man is elevated, not denigrated, while Eckehart mockingly rejects those who claim to be justified by works: "And, especially, avoid all peculiarity, whether it be in the clothing, in food, speech, use of impressive words or extravagant gestures, with which indeed nothing creative is achieved." There then follows the clearest assertion of the right of the true personality:

> However, you must know that in no way is everything special forbidden to you. There is much that is strange which one must often retain and among many peoples. For whoever is a special man, must also do something special, at many times in diverse manner.

In which respect, no exception is made for authority and priesthood (which is allegedly untouchable even if the holder of the rank of a criminal). Each is to be measured solely by the greatness of his individual soul. Once again we experience the consciously anti-Roman, consciously Germanic withdrawal inward.

Jesus once causes a sick man to arise on the Sabbath and take up his bed, whereupon the pious of the land raised a great outcry. But Jesus answered with superior contempt that the Sabbath was there for the sake of man not man for the sake of the Sabbath; consequently, man was also master over the Sabbath. The imitators of the Jerusalem Pharisees have also kept to the strict observance of all devout practices, ignoring the fact that the essence of man was a determining factor. Eckehart says to them:

> Believe me; it is also a part of perfection that a man exalts himself in his works, so that all his works form one whole. This must happen in the kingdom of God where man is God. There all things will respond to him in a godly manner, there, also, a man is master of all his works.

This relationship to outward action is more than unequivocal. But, equally clear, is Eckehart's rejection of all those virtues which are held to have a basis in mysticism. Nothing is more characteristic of Eckehart's outlook than the interpretation which he gives to Christ's words about Martha and Mary:

> Everything finite is only a means. The unavoidable means without which I cannot reach to God is my work and my creativity in the here-and-now. Such things do not influence us all to be concerned for our eternal salvation.

Here is a characteristic withdrawal by German man from the Indian creed of the Atman-Brahman doctrine; deeds are unimportant although they are not to be disposed as such. Mary sitting at Jesus's feet appears to Eckehart as the pupil. Martha, on the other hand, is the superior:

> "Martha feared that her sister would remain rooted in ecstasy and beautiful feelings and wished that she might become like herself."

Then Christ answered as follows:

> "Be content, Martha, she has also chosen the best part which may never be taken from her! This extravagance will soon quiet down."

As one sees, Eckehart's disinclination toward everything sweet and fluid even goes so far as to give an opposite meaning to the clear sense of Jesus's words.

With unmistakable irony, Eckehart speaks to the female heretics surrounding him—the Beguines (as the "Apostates" were then called):

> But now our good people desire to be perfect in such degree that no

> kind of love can move us any longer and we are left untouched by love as by sorrow. They do themselves injustice! I assert that the saint is still to be born who cannot be moved . . . even Christ did not achieve this, as is proved by his words: 'My soul is sad unto death.' Such words caused Christ woe . . . and that was because of his inborn nobility and the holy union of divine and human nature.

He adds:

> Now certain people even wish to bring matters to such a pass, that they may be rid of works. I say that this is not important! This we also find evidenced in Christ, from the first moment onward, when God became man and man God, then he also began to work for our blessedness . . . there was no part of his body which was without its special share in this.

What was the reason that Eckehart preached this anti-church doctrine? It was to allow spiritual freedom to prevail. That is, the highest good which Eckehart, and with him Nordic-Western man, recognizes. He expresses this in the following manner:

> God is not a destroyer of any kind of works but a perfecter. God is not a destroyer of nature but its perfecter. If God had destroyed nature even before the beginning, then violence and injustice would have been done to it. He did no such thing! Man has a free will with which he can choose good and evil. God places the choice before him of evil-doing which brings death, of right-doing which brings life. Man must be free and a master of all his works, undestroyed and unconstrained.

In these words the eternal, mutually fruitful polarity of nature and freedom have been recognized and expressed in a splendid way. Swept aside with the hand of a religious and philosophic genius, conscious of our intrinsic racial structure, is the barren Phariseeism, the torturing oriental priestly justification-by-works. The "sacred union" of God and nature is the primal ground of our being, represented in freedom of the soul, crowned by the fruitfulness of its works. And the driving power behind all is—the will.

According to the New Testament, the angel Gabriel came to Mary. But Eckehart smilingly says: "Actually, he was no more called Gabriel than he was a messenger, for Gabriel means power. God was active in this birth and is still active as power." With this the dynamic of Eckehart's soul is also revealed in the clearest light.

* * *

The freedom of Eckehart's soul necessarily prompts another evalution, not only of life and of works, but also of the highest ideals of the Roman church, of traditional Christianity in general, and thus of the entire revealed world, then and now.

If one recognizes the "noble soul" as the highest value, as the axis upon which everything is suspended, then the ideas of love, humility, mercy, pity, etc., form a second and third stage. Here also Eckehart does not shy away from hearing the voice of the "little spark," from speaking freely what his soul says to him. Naturally, it does not need to be particularly emphasized that he does not disparage love, humility or mercy. On the contrary, we find in his sermons the most beautiful words about these ideas though he detests the sweet ecstasy of undisciplined "lovely feelings"; in short, the lack of spiritual control. His doctrine of love is the representation of love as the power which knows itself to be identical with that divine power for whose victory it fights. Love must "break through things," for only "a spirit which has become free, compels God to itself." One must consider what it meant for a Dominican, prior to the beginning of the 14th century, to undertake in the face of an intolerant world-ruling church, a transvaluation of the values heretofore held to be the highest. Indeed, it was risky to even attempt to communicate a new supreme, positive value to the simple believer. He dared not attack Rome openly; rather, he had to speak in terms of a positive, metaphorical representation of spiritual experience. Bearing this in mind, one should read Eckehart's sermon on the "loneliness of the soul," which is perhaps the most beautiful statement ever made of the awareness of the Germanic essence.

In this, Eckehart deals with the highest values of the Christian church—love, humility and mercy—finds that, in loftiness, depth and greatness, they must give way to a soul which is completely detached. He rejects Paul's glorification of love in particular, for the best thing about love is its impulsion to love God. But it is far more important that we impel God to us, rather than impelling ourselves toward God. Only in this way can our soul become one with God. "Therefore, God cannot avoid giving himself to a lonely heart." Furthermore, the sorrows of this world in pursuing possessive love still relate to the creature which is not the case with mystical detachment. This lessens the compulsion of the world and brings us nearer to God. Eckehart is concerned that the virtue of humility might cause a lowering of man's self-esteem. "Such a posture of humility might cause man to lower his self-respect. Man's possession of a

sense of inner worth is most important." Man must become detached from material concerns.

> Perfect detachment knows no looking down to the creature, no bending of self and no elevation of self. It will be neither under nor over. It strives neither for equality nor for inequality with any other kind of creature, it does not wish this or that; it wishes only to be one with itself.

The autocratic soul has nowhere expressed itself so sharply and clearly as here. It is the necessary rhythmic counter-movement after the recognition of the fruitful work, that which Goethe later praised as the highest of all gospels: Regard for oneself.

Compassion, according to Eckehart, is nothing other than a giving of oneself. It is, for the same reason, not to be valued as highly as detachment. And because God's essence is also detached from all names, it follows that nothing of lower order can approach him. Here, Eckehart sets a limit to the importance of prayer invested with so much magic.

> I maintain that prayers and good works are of little value to man so great is God's detachment from man. Therefore, God is no more inclined toward man, than if the prayer or good work had never been performed.

This is more than clear: He completely rejects any intercession based on or approximating magic. He rejects the idea of the church "which alone can bring bliss." And then in conclusion there follows a popular creed:

> Keep thyself apart from all men, remain untroubled by all outward impressions, make theyself free of all which could give to thine essence an alien addition . . . and direct thy mind at all times to holy contemplation; with which thou bearest God in thy heart, as the object, from which thine eyes never waiver.

This calm, detached greatness of soul, then, expresses itself in the criticism of the Roman and later, Protestant, doctrine.

In this world of appearances, a spiritual strengthening as a result of inward concentration cannot be imagined by us otherwise than as a gift of the eternal essence of God. Against this background, Paulinism—and with it all Christian churches—has built up the doctrine of grace as highest mystery of Christianity. The Jewish representation of the "slave of God," one who receives mercy from an arbitrary, absolutist God, has thus passed over to Rome and Wittenburg and can be attributed to Paul.

He is the actual creator of this doctrine. It can truly be said that our churches are not Christian but Pauline. Jesus unquestionably praised One Being with God. This was his redemption, his goal. He did not preach a condescending granting of mercy from an almighty being in the face of which even the greatest human soul represented a pure nothingness. This doctrine of mercy is naturally very welcome to every church. With such misinterpretation the church and its leaders appear as the "Representatives of God." Consequently, they could acquire power by granting mercy through their magic hands. A genius like Eckehart had to adopt a position completely different from the concept of compassion. He also finds beautiful words about love and mercy of God: "Where compassion is in a soul," then this soul is "pure and godlike and god-related." Eckehart's man achieves the fullness of the soul rather than submitting to the depths of subjugation. Man seeks to move inward and to adhere to, and be one with God. "That is true mercy, compassion." This compassion is probably not possible through philosophies that teach only God's universal power and our nothingness. Such is the case with our churches. The truth, on the contrary, is that man's soul is like unto the spirit of God. Eckehart here refers to Augustine's confessions—works well known to Eckehart—whose teachings about the soul nevertheless led to a complete spiritual breakdown. Augustine demands the death penalty for heretics. Augustine's "State of God" was written to produce a spiritual slavery in man. But Eckehart assumes a different state of man's soul: "If it did not possess this greatness, then it could not become God even through grace." Here, again, we find the characteristic position of the superior Nordic man in developing his thoughts on the basis of clear, spiritual instinct (Eckehart of Hocheim was of Thuringian nobility) in the face of the assertions of the dissolute, slavish, bastardized Augustine. By partaking in the lasting vitality of God the soul is elevated to ever higher light:

> Then every power of soul becomes the copy of one of the divine persons; the will is the copy of the holy spirit, the perceptive power that of the son, the memory that of the father. Its nature becomes the likeness of Nature. And yet the soul remains indivisibly one. That is the ultimate knowledge in this matter of which my self-recognition renders me capable.

The supreme avowal then follows:

> Now hear, as to how far the soul becomes God, even above grace and mercy! What God had in fact provided you shall not change again for it has attained a higher position where it no longer has need of grace.

One should compare this splendid aristocratic creed with the touchingly struggling, yet half-African, Augustine, in his assertions about the morality of man and his perpetual sinfulness.

Thoughts are openly expressed here by Eckehart which even Luther—whose ideas were still inhibited by his education under the "Representative of Christ"—still did not dare to think. From this attitude to the idea of grace, there also results with Eckehart a totally different estimation of sin and repentance.

"Sin is no longer a sin once we repent," are the words with which Master Eckehart begins his sermon on the "blessings of sin." These are words which lead him miles away from the contrition usually demanded. Naturally, we ought not to sin, but even if the individual action has been 'directed against God,' then the 'great and splendid God' nevertheless knows how the best is to be gained from such an action. Thus God does not add up the past in an accounts books, for 'God is a God of the present'. Eckehart takes another step away from the historical materialism of our churches. Only later did Paul de Lagarde dare to speak so openly as once did this Dominican prior from the 14th century. For this reason Lagarde was condemned by the Protestant priests as Eckehart once was by the Roman.

Eckehart distinguishes two types of repentance: That which is of the senses and that which is godly. The first—which the church clearly understood—remains "rooted in misery and does not move from the spot." It thus signifies only unfruitful lamentation; 'nothing comes of it.' Things are otherwise with divine repentance: "As soon as inner disapproval arises in a man, he at once elevates himself to God and sets himself with unshakeable will armed securely against every sin." Thus, here, the direction upward is stressed anew and everything evaluated only according to whether it made the soul creative; elevated or not: "But whoever may really have come into the will of God, will not wish that the sin into which he had fallen might not have existed." This is the same as Goethe asserted when he declared that a human teacher would also appreciate error: "What is fruitful, alone is true."

Seen from Master Eckehart's standpoint, that is, from the perspective of one who is detached, godlike, free, beautiful and has noble soul, all the traditional highest church values appear to be of a second and third rank. Love, humility, compassion, prayer, good works, mercy, repentance—all these are good and useful but only under the one condition that they strengthen the power of the soul, elevate it, make it become more like God. If they do not, then all these virtues become useless, even harmful.

The freedom of soul is a value in itself. Church values merely signify something in relation to a moment outside them, be it God, soul or "the creature." The nobility of the self-reliant soul is the highest of all values. Man must serve the cause of the noble soul alone. We of the present day call it the deepest metaphysical root—this idea of honor—which is likewise an idea in itself, without any relationship to any other value. The idea of freedom is inconceivable without honor just as honor is without freedom. The soul is capable of good in and of itself, even without any relationship to God. Eckehart teaches that the soul is released from all else insofar as this release can be expressed in words at all. As a result, Master Eckehart shows himself, not as an ecstatic enthusiast, but as the creator of a new religion—our religion—released from that injected alien spirit of Syria, Egypt and Rome.

* * *

Eckehart not only provided us with a highest religious and moral value, but as already alluded to, he anticipated from a critical philosophical perspective all the important discoveries made by Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, even if he did not become enmeshed in hair-splitting arguments. Eckehart discovers three powers by which the soul reaches into the world: The will which turns toward the object; reason, which perceives and then orders what is grasped; and memory, which preserves what is experienced and witnessed. These three powers are, so to speak, the counterpart of the Holy Trinity. A whole series of the profoundest discussions are devoted to the theme of reason and will. Both are spiritually free and always dependent upon the mood and occasion during his sermons over many decades.

Reason "perceives" all things, but it is the "will," Eckehart comments, which "can do all things."

> Thus where reason can go no futher, the superior will flies upward into the light and into the power of faith. Then the will wishes to be above all perception. That is its highest achievement. On the other hand, reason, which separates, orders and places, then so perceives that it nevertheless gives the will its first real upward flight. In this respect, reason stands above the will. The will is free: God does not force the will, he sets it free; so that it wishes nothing other than what is God and freedom itself! Then the spirit can wish nothing other than what God wishes. This is not bondage but rather a peculiar kind of freedom.

Eckehart then quotes Christ's words: "He has not wished to make us into servants, but to call us friends. For a servant knows not what his master wishes." This new and constantly repeated emphasis on the idea of freedom is not, however, always matched by experience. Eckehart says,

> This is my complaint: This experience is something so profound but also so common, that thou mayst not buy it for a penny or a half-penny. Solely, thou must have a proper mode of seeking and a free will, then it will immediately become yours.

This is identical to Kant's teaching concerning the conflict between idea and experience in both the theoretical and practical aspects. At the same time, Eckehart mocks "many priests who are highly praised yet wish to be great priests." Kant spoke likewise about the schoolmasters, those "philosophers who only repeat thousand-year-old gossip."

Briefly put, everything that this soul may somehow bring forth must be summarized in the simple unity of the will. The will must be impelled toward the highest good, and then, adhere to it, unmoved. Properly regarded, the idea of love has a place in Eckehart's spiritual perceptive-critical work. It does not serve the ecstatic power of the imagination nor does it bring sweet feelings or sexual-psychic ecstasy. These perceptions are lies which the church has spread by its cunning use of hypnosis. They impede the progress of the freely creative will which ought to be dominant in the finest sense. "Whoever has more will, has also real love," states Eckehart. This represents the opposite of the teachings of the Roman clergy and of the present day, increasingly rigid, Protestant churches which would like to exterminate the personal will in order to then place "love" above will.

Eckehart was conscious of his unique position. Witness his words:

> In the best sense, love falls completely and totally into the will . . . But there is a second . . . effect of love, which is perceived by an inner eye as jubilant, devotion. But . . . that is in no way the best . . . for it does not originate out of love of God, but from mere naturalness . . .

From a love subordinate to the free will there awakens the true concept of loyalty. It brings, perhaps, no longer the "feelings" and "experiences" and "rapture" as the "faithfulness" of the servant, but it is only true when it is paired with a strong will.

We must elevate ourselves with the "winged pair of reason and will":

"Thus one never comes to folly, but advances without interruption into the might," not through an uncertain flightiness, but through an awakened consciousness. As Eckehart says, "With each work one must consciously make use of his reason. . .and grasp God in the highest possible sense."

The mastery of the will, of reason, of the memory, relates to the senses mediating the ego and nature. These again are directed to the external world in which man is to be understood as person. This whole multiplicity of manifestations is conditioned by space and time, which—as mentioned—Eckehart likewise linked with this world. Moreover, his entire religious doctrine is without causality because of the comprehension of God as the God of the present. A genetic historical-causal process does not interest him at all. This belongs to the external world, not to knowledge of the soul and of God. With this, Eckehart rejects the Oriental mixture of freedom and nature and all those fables and "miracles" without which the churches of "the generation of adulterers" (as Jesus called them) could not manage today. Whether the earth is a disc or a ball floating in the ether has no bearing on true religion nor on Eckehart's teaching. But this discovery by Copernicus has significantly affected our two Christian churches because they have deceived themselves as well as the world by their shameful lies on the subject.

Particularly in his teaching on the will wherein Eckehart anticipated and surpassed Schopenhauer, Eckehart reveals himself as a Western-dynamic philosopher recognizing the eternal polarity of existence. The essence of the achievements of reason is a "moving up of external things" in order to "imprint" this knowledge on the soul. This same motion is set forth, in the will, which, as a result, likewise never attains rest. Thus, even the incomparable mystic who would separate from everything in order to abide in pure contemplation of God, strives for "endless calm in God." He knows that this calm can only last moments, and that this goal can only be reached through the constantly renewed activity of the soul and its powers. Here Master Eckehart shows himself to be superior to Indian wisdom and recognizes eternal rhythm as the precondition of all fruitfulness. From this theoretical insight he then draws practical conclusions for life. If the heart and the will seek what is eternal:

> This man seeks not repose; for no unrest disturbs him. This man stands well recorded with God because he accepts all things as divine, that is, better than they are in themselves! To this belongs diligence and a wakeful, truly effective awareness upon which the

> mind has to be based despite all things and people. Man cannot learn this by fleeing from the world.

Eckehart believed he discovered a duality in Jesus as a fundamental law of his being.

> With Jesus, there is a distinction between man's higher and his lower powers. There are corresponding levels of deeds. Man's higher powers are suited to possessing and enjoying of eternal bliss. Simultaneously the lower powers were confronted by utterly wretched sorrow and respite on earth. One of the powers stood in direct conflict with the other. The longer and stronger the dispute between higher and lower powers, the greater and more praiseworthy the victory and the greater the honor of the victory.

* * *

In contrast to the personality of Eckehart, the magical-religious system of Rome stands out even more clearly before us. This is the African-Syrian chaos of peoples, the "religion of possession" which, by spreading from the eastern Mediterranean through the aid of magical cults and the Jewish Bible, and by misuse of the phenomenon of Jesus, created its Western center. With the progressive awakening of the West, and, after the strangling of mysticism, this middlepoint has made every effort to detract from the anti-Roman view of the world, to represent the *Una Catholica* as satisfying all, even modern, demands. This is the way one goes to work today.

The Roman Jesuit philosopher establishes three principal kinds of spiritual outlooks toward the world: Imminence, which wishes to rest within itself; Transcendence, which permits only God to be held as first creator (hence the doctrine of deism): and Transcendentalism, which represents an attempt at linking the two other spiritual orientations. For thousands of years philosophical arguments have revolved around these outlooks. The Roman church claims to stand above this struggle as apart from, and yet incorporating, all three types. The conflict between these philosophical types can, in fact, never—says Rome—attain unity. All attempts to overcome the antinomies of life within the three systems are in vain and always arrive at an enforced declaration of the identity of opposites. This occurred because all three typical outlooks formed the same "false" assumption; as if man were somehow equal to God, as if

God, so to speak, were only the boundlessly remote ideal of human striving. As a result, the creature will be regarded as "created self-dependent" which is identical to an attempt at spiritual destruction of the creative God behind everything. The Roman doctrine now intrudes here with its "fundamental outlook," namely, that according to the fourth Lateran Council of 1215, God is like and unlike his creature simultaneously. Like, because he has placed in the latter the possibility of restlessness in the face of God; unlike, because as a lowly creature he could only find "rest in God." Man thus lives not in his spiritual atmosphere but in the sphere of influence of an absolute, remote, ruling God. The Catholic man is thus "open upward" which results in a true striving tension without "convulsions" or "explosive unity." (Przywara, S.J.) This was the foundation of Rome, the "*Analogia Entis*," the analogy of Being.

> God is differentiated in reality and essence from the world. He is inexpressibly elevated above everything which can be thought about him. God has, in an allegory of creative perfection and for revelation of his perfection, performed creation from nothing in perfect freedom.

This Roman thought process which is said to have apparently already existed before "Peter's calling," shows its origin only too clearly. The unapproachable terrifying God enthroned over all; the Jehovah of the so-called Old Testament who is praised in contrition and prayed to in fear. He created us from nothing. When it suited him he performed magical miraculous deeds and shaped the world to his glory. But in spite of fire and sword, this Syrian-African belief was not to be forced upon the Europeans. The hereditary, Nordic spiritual values existed in the consciousness not only of the God-likeness but of the God-identity of the human Aryan soul. The Indian doctrine of the identity of Atman with Brahman—"The Universe is Being, because itself is the Universe"—was the first great declaration of this. The Persian doctrine of the common struggle of man and Ahura Mazda-the-luminous showed us the unadorned Nordic-Iranian outlook. The Greek heaven of the gods sprang from just such a great soul as Plato's aristocratic doctrine of ideas. The ancient Teutonic idea of God is likewise inconceivable without spiritual freedom. Jesus also spoke of the kingdom of heaven within us. The strength of spiritual search already shows itself in the world wanderer, Odin. It can be seen in the seeker and believer, Eckehart. And we see it in all great men from Luther to Legarde. This soul also lived within the venerable Thomas of Aquinas and in the majority of Western fathers of the church. The

Analogia entis (if one leaves out an assumption of creation of the world from nothing) has been forced on the Nordic-European spirit by the Old Testament. The Roman system has not been perfected "since Jesus." Rather, it is a proven compromise between Syria-Africa and Europe for which every possible kind of spiritual synthesis was forged. Roman authorities made the arrogant declaration that there were parts of the Catholic doctrine which alone could bring salvation. Thomas and his opponent Duns Scotus could hardly be tolerated by Rome. Such was no longer the case with Eckehart, for the latter's acceptance would have signaled the dismissal of Jehovah. The dismissal of this tyrant god would have been synonymous with the dethronement of his papal representative. Since then, European spiritual development has gone its way without, while alongside and against, Rome, although the latter, where it could, tried to crush it. If this suppression failed then the new idea was merely "incorporated" and defined as, "in part, early Catholic property."

Essentially, the Roman idea of the demon elevated to God necessitated annihilation of the soul and its capacity for willing: an assassination attempt on the polarity of the spiritual being. Through the *Analogia entis* the modern Roman-Jesuit philosophy of religion attempts to evade its unfortunate consequence.

Rome has made use of the old Platonic idea of being and becoming. We strive in eternal becoming but with the consciousness of a being which "becomes." Because of Roman-Jewish falsification, this Nordic idea of self-realization received the meaning of a movement of the creature "toward God," and with such an effect that from self-fulfillment a realization of God grows in whose hands we nevertheless only represent shapeless clay or a corpse.

These apparent concessions by Roman Jehovahism to the spiritually conscious West—with its capacity for willing—have still not lured many to come under the sway of Rome. Had the true nature of Rome been discovered and laid bare, it would long since have passed away. Whether I bestow myself with spiritual freedom, as Eckehart did, or bow myself slavishly down before the Lord as Ignatius did, is important only within the context of a particular system. Some are kneaded like clay, used like a stick, or turned into a corpse. It is such things that forge the difference between man and man, system and system, and, in the final analysis, between race and mestizoism. Rome-Jehovah means magical despotism and magical creation out of nothing—ideas which are insane to us. The Nordic West says: God and Self are a spiritual polarity. Every perfected

union is an act of creation calling up renewed dynamic forces. The real Nordic soul in its highest form always flies "toward God." It always moves "here from God." Simultaneously it "rests in God" and "reposes in itself." This union, felt simultaneously as a giving-away and self-consciousness, is called Nordic mysticism. Roman "mysticism" means, fundamentally, the impossible demand for the abolition of polarity and of what is dynamic; it means the subjection of mankind.

Roman philosophy does not stand, as it asserts, outside the three kinds of spiritual orientation in the form of Immanence, Transcendence and Transcendentalism. It embodies them all, but it represents an attempt at compromise, binding parts within the Jewish-Syrian-African belief. The Roman doctrine does not flow through the world from one center in a thousand streams. Rather, it dresses its Syrian foundation with the borrowed and misrepresented teaching of the Nordic man—which he built in his "world of ideas"—in a wholly different folkish personality. Here is the origin of the problem of our existence in the world, of our "being here," of our "being as such."

With its assertion of the creation of the world from nothing by a God, the Jewish-Roman doctrine proclaims a causal link between "creator" and "creature." It thus transforms an outlook only applicable to this world into the metaphysical realm. Even today, it asserts its position, that it "represents" the creator. The Germanic spirit has been involved in conflict with this monstrous fundamental principle from the first. Even the oldest Nordic creation myth, the Indian, does not recognize the idea of nothingness. It speaks only of a fluctuation, change, chaos. It conceives the cosmos as having arisen from an ordering principle working against chaos. It reflects on the idea of one who brings order, but not one who creates something out of an original void. It rejects creation *ex nihilo* with the rhetorical question, "From whence come creation and creator?" Further,

> He, who brought forth creation,
> Who gazes upon it in Heaven's highest light,
> Who has made or not made it,
> Who knows it! or does he not know?

Indian monism was actually born of a sharp dualism: the soul alone was regarded as essential: matter, as a delusion which is to be overcome. A creation of matter, even from nothing, would have appeared to every Aryan Indian as blasphemous materialism. In the Indian myth of creation, a similar mood prevails as in Hellas and Germania: Chaos orders itself to

a will, under a law, but a world never arises from nothing as the Syrian-African desert fathers taught and Rome took over with its demon Jehovah. Schiller's assertion: "If I think of God, I give up the creator," signifies in the concisest form the clear rejection by the Aryan-Nordic soul of the magical linking of "creator and creature," as God and honorless creature. Rome has blended Isis, Horus, Yahweh, Plato, Aristotle, Jesus, Thomas, etc. Rome wishes to force this version of "Being as such" onto the "empirical existence" of races and peoples. Where this is not successful, Rome will cause it to seep in by flattering falsifications; crippling our organic existence. It then gathers all those who are crippled spiritually and racially under the "Catholic" roof.

Until the present, only a little opposition has coalesced which is capable of preventing this massive destruction of peoples. One great man refuted the Roman medicine man philosophy; another fought it on his own; the third turned to other tasks. The systematic securing of Europe from this far-reaching attack has nowhere yet begun. In this struggle, Lutheranism, is unfortunately an ally with Rome. In spite of its "protestings," Lutheranism has shut itself off from life by its oath to the Jewish Bible. It likewise preached its view of our "being as such" without directing itself according to organic existence. Today, an awakening finally begins from this hypnotic state. We do not approach life from a conformistic dogma, especially from that of Jewish-Roman-African origin. We wish to determine the necessity of our "spiritual being as such," just as Master Eckehart once strove to do. But Being of this kind has as its essence the racially-linked soul with its necessary supreme values of honor and freedom. These supreme values determine the structure of the other, lesser values. This "race soul" lives and unfolds itself in nature. It awakens certain qualities and suppresses others. These forces of race, soul and nature are the eternal prerequisites of existence and life, from which culture, belief, art, etc., result as "spiritual Being," This is the final inward withdrawal, the new awakening *mythos* of our life.

Paracelsus was an awakened man living in a world of inflated abstract scholars who were alienated from the people. Self-appointed authorities from Greece, Rome and Arabia were poisoning the living human body, making the sick even worse and, despite all mutual quarrels, standing like a wall against the genius Paracelsus who reached down searchingly into the primal grounds of existence.

Theophrastus von Hohenheim was a latter day genius. It was his task to investigate nature in the totality of its laws and to evaluate medicines as structural means furthering the life process of our body. His investiga-

tions were unconnected to magical mixtures. These things drove von Hohenheim through the world of his day. He was hated and feared, for he had the stamp of dissident genius. He did not regard churches and altars, doctrines and words, as "things in themselves." Rather, he evaluated them according to how deeply they were rooted in nature and racial blood. Like the great Paracelsus, von Hohenheim became the vocal leader of all German natural scientists and mystics, a great preacher of our existence, our existential Being in the world. In order to raise himself up from the earth, von Hohenheim reached for the stars like Master Eckehart and masterfully, yet modestly, fitted himself into the great laws of the universe. He was full of bliss with the pure notes of the nightingale, with the unfathomable, overflowing creation of his own heart.

* * *

With his anti-Roman religion, his moral teachings and his critique of cognition, Eckehart consciously separated himself, indeed abruptly, from all basic tenets of both the Roman and the later Lutheran churches. In place of the static Jewish-Roman outlook, he asserts the dynamic of the Nordic Western soul; in place of monistic violence he demands the recognition of the duality of all life; in place of the doctrine of subjection and blissful slavery, he preaches belief in freedom of soul and will; in place of ecclesiastical arrogance by the "representatives" of God, he places the honor and nobility of the spiritual personality; instead of enraptured, self-subjecting love, he offers the aristocratic ideal of personal spiritual detachment and loneliness; in place of the violation of nature appears its perfection. And all this means that in place of the Jewish-Roman view of the world, the Nordic spiritual creed appears as the inward side of German-Teutonic man—of the Nordic race.

Eckehart knew that he spoke only to a few within the church; therefore, he often had dealings with the heretical Beguines and Begardes, preached to and had long table talks with them. They speak of him as "Brother Eckehart." While he rejected, piece by piece, the Roman-Syrian conformistic dogmas, he spoke against the "heretics" in not a single one of his sermons. He wished to seek out and unite men who held like views within the church. This was his goal in Erfurt, Strasburg, Cologne and Prague. Eckehart flatly rejected the view that there could be doctrines in which one simply "must believe" merely because this was demanded by his superiors or by tradition. To substantiate this claim he

calls on reason and on the doctrine of freedom of the soul. He tells his listeners that if they wished to follow his teachings they must be prepared to stand, body and soul, with the truth. Those who, as always, try to subvert the truth were there to reject and refute the ideas of the spirit. When Eckehart taught in Cologne, the fires of the Inquistion burned at the stake around him. Even within his own order many complained that he spoke too much in the vernacular to the "common people" concerning things which could lead to heresy. The archbishop of Cologne then complained about Eckehart to the Pope. The Roman pontiff would gladly have eliminated him, but he needed the political support of the Dominicans in his struggles with the emperor and so could not afford to burn their spiritual head. Therefore the "Eckehart case" was investigated by a member of the order who absolved him. Such an absolution would not have been possible according to the dogma of infallibility at the beginning of the "free" 20th century. And then the Inquistion proceeded to its work. On 24 January 1327, Eckehart rejected their intrusion as an arbitrary act and invited his enemies to appear before the Pope in May, 1327. A similar declaration by Eckehart at the Dominican church at Cologne closed with the words: "Without, in consequence, abandoning a single one of my principles, I will improve or withdraw. . .all those concerning which it can be proved that they are based upon faulty use of reason."

In accordance with their logic, Eckehart's declaration was completely rejected by the devout inquisitors as "frivolous." But before he could travel to the Pope he died. In any event, the great power which could have made a German church out of the Roman was broken. His German "religion" was afterward officially "condemned" by Rome. Initially, according to established method, to deceive his supporters, Eckehart's "recantation" was broadcast as a general apology, although Eckehart, on the contrary, had been ready to defend his teachings with the utmost vehemence. It is characteristic of his freedom of spirit that he did not summon up church dogmas; indeed, not even the Bible, as Luther did later, but based his arguments solely on free rational perception. After this first forgery, the devout followers of Rome "corrected" Master Eckehart and ranked him as a spiritual pupil of Thomas of Aquinas.

From the 13th century onward there was a general dissolution of the Catholic center with a corresponding degeneration of church and clergy in all nations. The masses would have lost their false faith also had it not been for a few leading personalities who, by devoting all their energies, saved the situation over and again. As a reaction against this degener-

ation, in the 13th century, the Societies of the Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit were formed in which the forerunners of mysticism can be seen. The Beguines and Begards worked with them in the same circles in which Master Eckehart had also maintained close contact. This pious, but unchurchly, movement passed outside and inside the church like a broad stream through the German lands. Above all else these movements seized upon a basic principle of the nearly defunct Aryan system as a tool to teach religion in the vernacular. This is the point at which the enduring struggle began between Volkish ideas and the Roman-Jewish church. Pope Gregory VII had described as arrogant the use of the vernacular in holy worship. The true Volk feeling rejected the alien Latin tongue which was thought to be unintelligible, and a mechanically repetitive magical formula. The religious German movement around the middle of the 13th century defied folk-hostile Rome and proceeded to the vernacular in worship. Sermons and doctrinal addresses were no longer spoken in Latin but in German. And the greatest pioneer of this innovation was Eckehart, whom his pupils and imitators—among others, Suso and Tauler—always called the "blessed and holy master." Eckehart, even if he had to write much in Latin, also made the German language into a language of science. He struggled with great effort for this, to replace the Latin sentence formation with German word-imprints. In this he was also a heretic whose work—trodden underfoot and half strangled through the Roman church—Martin Luther continued. Thus the prerequisites for Volkdom were created.

Today Catholic priests preach in German, but the entire liturgy, the utterances, and also the hymns and prayer formulas must still be murmured by the Catholics among our people in Latin tongue. The church cannot give this up because it must preserve its unnational character, but the peoples may soon no longer tolerate this alien heathen relic. Fundamentally, there is no difference between the Tibetan who turns his prayer wheel and the German peasant who prays in Latin. Both signify only a mechanical practice in contrast to real religious absorption.

The real Eckehart vanished then, thanks to the Roman forgeries, from the eyes of the German people. True, the religious wave passed over the land of Widukind, down the Rhine, and everywhere there arose believers in the freedom of the soul: Suso and Tauler, Ruysbroek and Grootes, Boehme and Angelus Silesius. But the greatest power of soul, the most beautiful dream of the German people had died too early; everything later is only—regarded objectively—reflection of Eckehart's great soul. Out of his manliness developed popular enthusiasm: from his powerful love

grew sweet ecstasy. Supported by the church in this attitude, the current of effeminate "mysticism" flowed again into the lap of the Roman church. Luther's deed finally broke through the alien crust, but, in spite of his longing, he never found his way back to the spiritual depth of Master Eckehart, never returned to his spiritual freedom. His church, unfree from the first day onward, dried up in one place and turned barren in another. The German soul had to seek a path other than that of the church. It struck upon this in art. When the spirit of Eckehart grew silent, Germanic painting arose. The soul of J.S. Bach resounded; Goethe's *Faust* was composed, Beethovan's 'Ninth,' Kant's philosophy. . .What was deepest and strongest still came from Eckehart's teaching; something which more than all else seems clairvoyantly directed at the men of our times.

Eckehart ends the sermon on "The Kingdom of God" with the following words: "This talk is addressed to none, unless they already feel it as part of their own life or at least possess it as a longing of their heart. That this may be revealed to us, help us God." Thus his words are directed only at those spiritually related. His teaching extends to all "inward or noble men," and a mystery is revealed here which is only today born again to new life. In a sermon on 2 Corinthians 1,2 Eckehart differentiates between blood and flesh. By blood, he understands—and so he believes with St. John—everything "which in man is not subject to his will." Thus, what is taking effect in the unconscious is a counterpart to the soul. And, in another passage, Eckehart says—concerning Matthew 10:28—"The noblest that is in men, is the blood—when it wishes what is right. But the most wicked, which is in man, is the blood—when it wishes evil."

With this, the last supplementary word has been spoken: *Alongside the mythos of the eternal free soul stands the mythos, the religion of the blood.* The one corresponds to the other without us knowing that here cause and effect are at hand. Race and Self, Blood and Soul, stand in the closest connection. Master Eckehart's teaching is not fit for scoundrels nor for that race mixture of alien type which has seeped into the heart of Europe from the east and forms the most subservient element of Rome. Eckehart's teaching of the soul is directed at the carriers of the same or related blood, persons who have similar lives or possess vision as "a longing of their heart"—not to the spiritually alien and the hostile of blood.

Master Eckehart then speaks the Volkish credo: "No vessel can hold two kinds of drink in itself: if it is to hold wine, one must pour out the

water so that not a drop remains." And further: "One should respect the manners of other people, and scorn no one's manners." Again, "It is impossible that all men should follow two paths simultaneously." And, then again: "For often, what is life to the one, is death to the other."

That is the complete opposite of what the church of Rome—and ultimately also, Wittenburg—teaches us. These Christian churches wish to force us all—whether white, yellow or black—upon one path, into one form and under one dogma. These things have poisoned our souls, our European racial heritage. What was its life was our death. We have not died because we have the power of the Germanic soul which thus far has prevented the final victory of Rome and Jerusalem. In Master Eckehart, the Nordic soul came to self-consciousness for the first time. All latter day great men walk in imitation of Eckehart. From the teachings of this great soul can—and will—the German Faith be reborn.

* * *

Eckehart shares a spiritual relationship with Goethe whose entire work was also rooted in freedom of the soul and in a commitment to the creative life. The artist has naturally stressed this in a much more definite way than the religious mystic. Goethe spent his life suspended between two worlds. If the one threathened to take him captive then he fled passionately into the other. Master Eckehart spoke, on the one side, of "solitude," and "work," on the other, while Goethe called these two conditions Mind and Deed. "Mind" signifies the stripping of the cares of the world, the extension of soul passing into infinity, and "deed," was directed at a creation in this world. Like Master Eckehart, Goethe has stressed again and again the law of our existence: That mind and deed are rhythmically alternating, self-conditioning and mutually enhancing essences of man; that one alludes to the other, allowing it to be recognized and become creative. To withdraw from the world and live for self-contemplation does not further our self-knowledge: "One can actually only observe and listen to oneself when actively engaged." Whoever has made it a habit to test action on thinking and thinking on action could not err, and, if he erred, then he would soon find himself back upon the right path. The "mind" which has always been a governing organ in us Indo-Europeans, needs no constant spurring on, and so we also find, with Goethe, few incitements to action. He is concerned with restricting action.

> I must confess that the great significant sounding task—know thyself—has always appeared suspicious to me from the beginning,

> as a cunning device fabricated out of whole cloth by priests who would confuse men by demanding the impossible of men. Such false prophets wish to lead men astray, away from activity directed at the outer world and into a false inward contemplation. Man only knows himself only insofar as he knows the world within which he becomes aware of himself. Every new object which is properly surveyed opens up a new possibility in us. Understanding can do nothing to heal sufferings of soul and reason can do less, but resolute activity on the other can do everything.

Goethe spent much of his creative energy in promoting the virutes of intellectual activity. The greatest hymn to human activity is his *Faust*. After the exploration and penetration of all science, of all love and suffering, Faust is liberated through the deed., i.e., action. To his powerful spirit which sought always to comprehend the infinite, the finite deed, the damming of a water torrent, thought was the most useful faculty of man, the final stone of life, the tool to conquer the unknown. The noble action finds its pinnacle in works of art. As Goethe wrote, "The true artist opens up the mind, for where words fail, deeds speak. . ." And again, "Who experiences the essence of things at an early age, arrives conveniently at freedom. . ." Further, the master wrote:

> A man need only declare himself to be free, to feel the moment. If he dares to declare himself to be finite then he feels himself free. A Master is whoever has the insight that limitation is also a necessary stage to the highest development even for the greatest spirit . . .

"How can one learn to know oneself?" Goethe asks. "One does not know himself through introspection but by action. Attempt to do your duty and you know at once what is in you. Duty is the demand of the day." In another place Goethe wrote, "For man it is a misfortune when any kind of idea takes firm root with him which has no influence upon active life or which draws him away from the latter." He also wrote that, "In my opinion, determination is the thing most worthy of respect in man. . .It is always a misfortune when a man is occasioned to strive for something with which he cannot discipline himself by regular self-activity."

Therefore even the smallest man can be "complete" if he "moves within the limits of his capacities. A material world is ready for us to create. On the spiritual path involvement and free activity regulated by love are always found. To move these two worlds reciprocally, to manifest their mutual qualities in the transitory shape of life, that is the highest

form to which man has to mold himself.

When Goethe had sated all his senses in Rome, he wrote: "I wish to know nothing more at all other than how to create something and exercise my mind rightly." But immediately afterward he says: "A new epoch is beginning with me. My mind is now so broadened through seeing and observing so much that I must restrict myself to some new kind of work." In another passage he says by way of summary: "I had spent my whole life composing and observing, synthetically and analytically. The systole and diastole of the human spirit was, for me, a second drawing of breath."

When Schiller died, he said, to control his despair: "When I had regained control of myself, I looked around for active diversions," and again, when in 1823 he was plagued by severe suffering after he had lost his son he called back to his mind that which already seemed to have lost itself in the beyond, and proclaimed: "And now forward—over graves!"

Essentially Goethe's spiritual condition resembles the real lives of all great men of the Nordic West. DaVinci conjured up an incomprehensible transcendental world in his Holy Anna, in the eyes of John the Baptist and in the fact of Christ. Simultaneously he was an engineer, a cool-headed technician who could not devise enough to make nature serviceable to man. One could offer the opinion about the many words of DaVinci's, that they might have sprung from the mouth of Goethe. With Beethoven, a sparkling scherzo suddenly appears after the deepest mystical rapture and his *Symphony to Joy* (9th Symphony) is a most touching song of solitude. Beethoven, who seemed to vanish in his dreams, at the same time uttered the words of dynamic Western man: "Strength is the morality of men who distinguish themselves before others. It is also mine." Also, "To grasp destiny by the throat," was how he represented his goal. Similar deep expressions also formed Michelangelo's personality. One should read his sonnets to Vittoria Colonna and then stand before his Sybyls and his world-condemning Christ. It also becomes clear to us that Western mysticism does not exclude life but, on the contrary, it has chosen creative existence as a partner. To enhance itself, it has need of antithesis. The more heroic the soul, all the mightier the outward works; the more detached the personality, the more radiant the deeds.

The dynamic Germanic nature never expresses itself in flight from the world but in overcoming it, in struggle, with it. This occurs in a twofold manner: in the Godly religious-artistic-metaphysical and in the Luciferian-empirical.

No other race has, in the same way, sent over the globe explorer after explorer—men who were not mere innovators but discoverers in the real sense. It was the Nordic West and its heroes who reshaped the chaos of what they found into a cosmos—an ordered world. Nordic men have visited the dark continents, the cold polar regions, tropical forests, bare steppes, the remote seas, inaccessible rivers and lakes and high mountains. Men at all times and in many places have dreamed of flying through space but only in the Nordic man did this longing become a force which led to invention. He who has never felt the power of forcefully overcoming time and space; he who has not felt, in the midst of machines and ironworks, in the midst of the interworking of a thousand wheels, the pulsebeat of material conquest of the world, he has not understood this one side of the Germanic-European soul and he will not understand the other mystical side. Recall the sudden outburst by hundred-year-old Faust:

> Die wenig' Baume nicht main eigen
> Verderben mir den Weltbesitz.
> The few trees not my own
> spoil possession of the world for me.

It is not mere greed for riches and high living that is shown here, but the urge of the master "who feels bliss in commanding."

One must differentiate between what is of Lucifer and what belongs to Satan. "Satanic" describes the moral side of the *mechanistic* conquest of the world. It is dictated by purely instinctive motives. It is seen in the Jewish attitude toward the world. "Luciferan" describes the struggle for the subjugation of matter without having the prerequisite of subjective interest as a driving motive. The first springs from an uncreative character, and will consequently never find anything, never discover, never really invent, while the second compels natural laws with the aid of natural laws, follows their track and builds works to make matter useful.

It is easy to understand that the Luciferan conquest of the world can easily become Satanic. For this reason, in a principally Luciferan era, such as that which vanished in the World War, Jewry necessarily finds it doubly easy to infiltrate and seek its possibilities for profit.

* * *

"Repose is superior to motion, the weak overcome the strong; softness overcomes rigidity": These words contain the mood of an entire culture.

They are the soul of the Chinese race whose ideas are embodied in the teachings of Lao Tse who lived 2,500 years ago and who speaks to us like some tired sage of today. No one will read the writings of Lao Tse without feeling himself enveloped by a wreath of essential truth. As one reads Lao Tse he realizes that this message is one of the most beautiful experiences wherein one can buoy up his frame of mind. Man should not strive to fathom the nature of man. He should know only one thing: "The destruction of the body is no loss. This is immortality." One must guard oneself against every excess while peacefully and calmly going one's mysterious, predestined way.

The joy of Lao Tse's wisdom is the longing for polarity between soul and spirit. But this is not in harmony with us and nothing is falser than to believe that the wisdom of the East is in accord with our own beliefs. Eastern thought must never be regarded as something superior to our own, in the way that Europeans, grown tired and inwardly devoid of rhythm, like to do today.

There exists a further contrast. In studying the history and literature of the Jews, one finds almost nothing but energetic, endlessly busy activity, a completely one-sided concentration of all energies upon material well-being. From this veritable amoral disposition of spirit a moral code originates which recognizes only one thing: The personal advantage of the Jew. This, in turn, results in religiously and morally permitted perjury, the Talmud "religion" of the "legal" lie. All naturally egotistic dispositions receive a boost in energy provided by the "morality" which is permitted to them. But, as is the case among almost all peoples of the world where religious and moral ideas and values are placed in the path of purely instinctive whims and lack of control, with the Jews it is the reverse. So, for 2,500 years we see eternally the same picture. Greedy for the goods of this world, the Jew moves from city to city, from land to land and remains where he finds the least resistence to his parasitical business activity. He is driven away but comes back again. One generation is destroyed and the other begins unalterably the same game. Jugglarlike and half-demonic, laughable and tragic at the same time, despising everything superior while nevertheless feeling himself innocent, we see that he is devoid of the capacity of being able to understand anything other than himself. Eternally he operates under the Satanic name and remains always the same, always fervently believing in his "mission" and yet forever a barren and condemned parasite. The eternal Jew forms a complete contrast to Buddha, to Lao Tse. With the one, repose, with the

other, activity; on the one side, goodness, on the other, slyness; with the one, peace, with the other, abysmal hatred toward all peoples of the world with the one, an understanding of everything, with the other, total incapacity and lack of understanding.

Equally far removed from both antitheses stands the Nordic idea. It is a new universe unto itself. The peace of Goethe, the repose of Lao Tse, the deeds of Bismarck are not in the same league as the activities of a Rothschild. The Germanic has neither the Chinese calm nor the Jewish activity in the sense of the personality, not the person. Our goals, our methods and our thoughts are totally different from those of the Chinese and the Jew.

Nordic man believes deeply in an eternal law of Nature: he knows that he is manifestly linked to it. He does not despise Nature but accepts it as the allegory of something supernatural. But he sees in non-Nature something other than mere arbitrariness. He does not satisfy himself in believing in immortality as such as he is astounded at every self-observation concerning the uniqueness of his non-natural self. He also finds an essentially different nature with every other person, likewise concealing within itself an equally rich microcosm with many references. If Lao Tse says that the perfected man does not come into conflict with 'others' because they all have the same direction, then, as compared with Nordic feeling, an attitude of indifference is seen here which leaves a traveller unheeding, wishing only silently to pursue his own course. Here, then, we face the question as to whether this apparently great and beautiful calm of the Chinese does not in fact signify an inner lack of motion of soul; the obverse side of an inwardness virtually devoid of life.

The Indian mystic also taught that 'others' followed the same path to the end. He believed he could speak the great words: "That art thou," to every creature of this world; but the emphasis of his metaphysical outlook is remote from the logical conclusions of the Chinese. Lao Tse devoted himself to the moral side of our nature and allowed the metaphysical to rest within itself. He preached a doctrine of honor toward the honorable and dishonorable alike and love for friend and foe. This is proper goodness, equally directed toward noble men. The Indian is absorbed completely in the metaphysical side of man. He lays such great weight upon this that he arrives, ultimately, at the view that action as such could not do harm to a participant sharing in Atman-Brahman. He will "not be defiled by works, by evil." All that is material is only deceit and appearance; what happens to him is a matter of indifference. Man's individuality

has no long-term existence. That is the ultimate conclusion of India.

Lao Tse teaches inactivity because the "path and the right way" are predestined for every man and, by acting, seeking and investigating, only discord and misfortune will follow.

Indian philosophy is fundamentally different from our own. Different souls and spirits are manifest in the two cultures. It becomes a crime to discuss the equality of "good men." The Indian believes that it is a thousand times more beautiful and sublime to see with what richness of soul each of us has come into this world. Both he and the Nordic man know how at different places upon earth different souls are at work struggling to express themselves. It is a great mistake to try to intrude here as strangers and to attempt to efface these contrasts. It is rare that a combination and merging of different souls and races has accomplished anything beautiful. Usually only misery appears following racial mixing. High intentions inspired missionaries who went to India and China where they only disturbed native racial developments. But we run the same risk today when men come and laugh at the great men of the West, while alluding to India and China as the great examples of the development of the soul which Europeans should emulate. As beautifully as Jajnavalkya speaks, as flattering as Lao Tse's words are, they are for the East. If we try to adopt these ideas, then we are spiritually lost. Either we go our own way or we fall into chaos, into the abyss of madness.

We know that we all have one longing; to emerge from "darkness into light," to move from our earthly bonds into an eternal unknown. But we confess that we are by no means content with knowing that we have, morally or metaphysically, struck out upon the same path with others. We are also interested in the reasoning behind our feeling and thinking. The Chinese have a thousand-volumed history which is not really a history but a chronicle; everything down to the smallest detail seems important to the narrator. The Indian devoted no real attention to such profane history. He has no real chronicle, no secular history. He has only his myths, songs and hymns. Neither race sought to walk the other's path of development. The one had not understood the outward effect of the personality, whether it be of a man or a people in general; the other saw it as mere appearance and therefore unimportant.

Germanic man appeared in world history as creator. He sailed around the entire earth. He discovered millions of worlds. In the heat of a tropical sun he excavated prehistoric, long-forgotten cities. He researched poems and myths. He sought after legendary fortresses. With indescribable

effort he deciphered papyrus rolls, hieroglyphics and inscriptions on clay fragments. He investigated thousand year old mortar and stone. He learned all the languages of the world. He lived among Bushmen, Indians, Chinese and formed for himself a varied picture of the souls of the peoples. He saw technology, morals, art and religion grow up from beginnings of the most diverse kinds of works of a different nature. *He comprehended personality because he was himself one.* He grasped the activity of peoples as action, as shaped spiritual power, as an expression of a uniquely personal inwardness. He not only had interest in the fact that men thought and acted in such and such a way, but he did not rest until he had learned to grasp the inner forces—whether rational or intuitive—which shaped the destiny of civilizations. It was popular for a long time to compare the Chinese and the Germans, because both peoples have been possessed by a mania for collecting and by a veritable disease for registering everything. This comparison remains completely superficial. One cannot measure the soul of a people by individual characteristcs but only by achievements. Thus the Chinaman remains a cataloger; the German, however, became a master of historical science. He built his collections of facts and deeds with a strong sense of both purpose and direction. With one, the ultimate end was mechanical coordination; with the other, a view of the world. That is the difference.

The German's talent for researching and writing history is deeper than just having a sense of what to save or discard. He brings true philosophical over-view to his study. He knows what things serve man, civilization and race. The Teuton—especially the German—feels in his heart the value and dignity of personality. He is filled with a conscious intuition of it, knowing that it must be felt as well as known. He is driven by a vital feeling, by the greatest activity of soul, to observe, investigate and fathom his fellow men. Therefore, he has understood history as the development of a people's personality. He has sought under thousand year old ashes and ruins evidence of human power. Here we have arrived, then, at one of the primordial phenomena which can neither be explained nor investigated.

Because the Germanic spirit instinctively feels the eternity and immortality of personality, because it does not dispute the intuitive awareness expressed as 'That thou art,' so there lives within it the longing to investigate what can be learned of alien personalities. The Greek did not concern himself with his pre-history because he regards time, development and personality as illusions. The Chinese collected all the data of his past, even recording the bowel motions of the mandarin. He collected

data about the person but did not indicate the realities of personalities. The conscious interpretation of any kind of culture as the expression of something never previously existing and never recurring, of something mysteriously unique—that is the fundamental mood of the Nordic-Germanic spirit with its mystique of action. This is the reason why Europeans were able to decipher heiroglyphics and Babylonian clay fragments. For this same reason, entire generations devoted their creative power in excavations in Greece and Egypt and on the Ganges and the Euphrates. They sought to recapture and interpret that spirit. If the European spirit had signified only a shaping of the outward person, then this organic widening and concentration would never have occurred. This is called the Faustian soul; the striving for infinity in every domain. But at the basis of this lies the uniqueness of personality felt nowhere else in the world with like strength and dignity.

From this feeling of respect for other cultures and races Herder was driven to collect the folksongs of peoples ranging from India to Iceland. To this end Goethe conjured up Persia for us in an enchanting way. Germanic scholars were able to present before us the realizations of the utterly remote—and yet often very close—Indian soul. They gave us a picture of the world rich in every respect, sharp in contrasts. History is therefore felt with great awareness; it unrolls before our mind's eye. Everything stands uniquely colored and shaped, portentious and alien at the same time. In the midst the Nordic man stands as the embodiment of the attainment of personal consciousness—that last mystery of existence. This inner frame of mind is the ultimate basis of what is broken down, fragmentary, abandoned, infinitely remote in all of European culture. Don Quixote, Hamlet, Parsifal, Faust, Rembrandt, Beethoven, Goethe, Wagner and Nietzsche, all lived, spoke and created. They are the witnesses to this experience. Here also the Nordic concept of action grows into something completely different from what Lao Tse understood by "doing," or what appeared to Buddha as harmful because of its bringing suffering. One must differentiate even more this idea of action from that energetic Jewish activity which has always revealed a purely materialistic purpose. The motivating force of Judaism is always material gain. Action for Western man is the expression of an inner essence in a development of soul without earthly purpose. Thus it is a form of our spiritual activity. By following this, we really live here on earth for the first time and for a higher purpose. We attribute a dignity to action which alone can lead us to knowledge of ourself. Here, I recall those profound words of Goethe: "Every well-considered deed releases a new capacity within us."

A completely different soul speaks here than in the writings of Lao Tse. It is fundamentally different from the ideas of he who taught the "fourfold holy path." Lao Tse rejects action alone because it must always be accompanied by doing. Buddha likewise fears suffering. But Goethe accepts suffering, even sees it as necessary, as elevating; "Whoever cannot despair, should not live." Like the great Master Eckehart, he frequently finds soul-expanding bliss in one single moment. In the experience of a creative deed, the whole of suffering is made worthwhile and thus overcome. Nothing can be compared with this power of the soul. It is primarily power, not at all silent and reconciled with abandonment; rather, it soars with broad wings over all that is earthly.

It is noteworthy to see how great men viewed the vital, inner feelings of a race—as opposed to mere externals. Briefly, to the Chinese, repose is the overcoming of action, a way to achieve one's destiny without conscious action. To the Indian, inactivity signifies the conquest of life, the first stage of passing over into eternity. To the Jew, repose signifies the prying out of an opportunity which promises material success. The calm of the Nordic man is self-reflection before action; it is mysticism and life simultaneously. China and India wish, in different manners, to overcome the pulsebeat of life. To the Jew, inactivity is only a consequence of external circumstances. The Northlander, on the contrary, wishes for inwardly conditioned, organic-creative rhythm. There are naturally only a few who are capable of carrying this Nordic rhythm throughout their entire life, through their entire works. But because of this they are the greatest of our spirit, our race.

In some of our great men this rhythm is active—in individuals with consuming passion—with a powerful intake of breath, such as in the works of DaVinci, Rembrandt, Bach and Goethe. With others, this pulsebeat proceeded more violently, suddenly, dramatically. This is revealed to us in the works of Michelangelo, Shakespeare, and Beethoven. Immanual Kant, who appears to many as the embodiment of moderation itself, emphasized as his deepest conviction that only by enthusiasm, by the highest spiritual readiness for action, can a great work be created. This was a sensitive self-confession. From the work of the sage of Konigsberg one hears the mighty beating of wings of the Nordic soul: "Never is anything great in the world achieved without enthusiasm."

Therefore, also, in what concerns our relationship to action, the spiritual attitudes of different people stand before our eyes. The otherwise different Chinese and Indians are on one side; the Jew, as antithesis and contradiction (not as spiritual antipode), is on the other. And, beyond

them, the Nordic-Germanic man is the antipode of both directions, grasping for both poles of our existence, combining mysticism and a life of action, being borne up by a dynamic vital feeling, being uplifted by the belief in the free creative will and the noble soul. Master Eckehart wished "to become one" with himself. This is certainly our own ultimate desire.

Book Two
THE NATURE OF GERMANIC ART

A work of art is the living
representation of religion

—Richard Wagner

I. Racial Aesthetics

THE time of the virtuosi seems to be nearing an end. We have grown tired of repeatedly allowing ourselves to be merely allured and bedazzled. We have had enough of the nervous showmanship of recent decades. We hate the technical display of everything which is called art. We feel that the period of intellectualism as a phenomenon which arrogated to itself the possession of cultural validity, lies in its death throes. We believe that the prophets who announce it as the wave of the future—as the ultimate end of our European culture—are already spokesmen of an obsolete past. These men, inwardly exhausted, had already lost their faith before they thought and wrote. Therefore, their philosophy and their view of history must also end in unbelief. Death and material power greedily consume their works. The weak are broken, while the strong feel their faith and resistance grows.

The retreat from theoretical materialism in science and art can be regarded as inwardly completed. The pendulum is already swinging in the opposite direction. The direction of our spirit begins—in contrast to both currents—gradually to become clear again.

The time of the aesthetes with their prolific works is here. Revisionist and culturally and racially superior works are being produced. The intellectual power of these works is overwhelming. The great literature of the

past is being revived. Alien works of past and present are being rejected. The general public honors Schiller, Kant and Schopenhauer. Still, there are limitations to their works. We are cautious of these not because we fail to find the profoundest thoughts in their works, but because we can no longer use them in their entirety for the study of art. Their limitations are clear. They look only to Greek art for inspiration and they all speak of the possibility of a universal aesthetics. If they would accept the fact of racial differences in art, then on their theoretical thought—the thought which we describe as the philosophy of the 18th century—we would have an acceptable base on which to build. Their thought could seize the art products of their own peoples. This contradiction between philosophical theory and concrete practice is present in Goethe, Schiller and Schopenhauer. The great fault of all 19th century aesthetics was that it was not likened to the works of the artists; it merely dissected works of art. The philosophers did not discern that Goethe's admiration of the Asiatic Laokoon was one thing and Faust's Nordic deeds something fundamentally quite different. Goethe's Nordic instinct was strong, but he fell into the trap of believing that the Hellenes were artistically superior to the Nordic art forms.

The starting point of the aesthetics of dissection was a false one for it failed to rationalize a philosophy of art. The 19th century aesthetics has not awakened a lucid Nordic racial consciousness. Nor has it given us a sense of direction. What it has given us is Greek—most often late, corrupted Greek—art as a standard for European art.

Much was made of an aesthetics and a philosophy of history for the allegedly superior Orient. Eventually, we rejected "the Orient" as a concept as we realized that these peoples had conflicting, often mutually exclusive, cultures and art. Today, it has become modern to speak again of the "West." We can speak of the "West" much more easily than we can speak of the "Orient." However, more emphasis must be placed on the role of the Nordic races here.

Heretofore, those philosophers who have written about the "aesthetic condition" or the establishing of values in art have by-passed the fact of a racial ideal of beauty. This ideal relates to the physical appearance of the racial types and to the race's supreme value. In this respect it is evident that if the nature of art is to be discussed, then the pure physical representation, for example, of a Greek, must have a different effect upon us than, for instance, the portrait of a Chinese emperor. Every outline receives a different function in China than in Hellas and, without which, recognition

of the racially conditioned formative will be neither interpreted nor "aesthetically enjoyed." Every work of art has a spiritual content. Along with its formal treatment this can only be understood on the basis of different race souls. Our former aesthetics are thus—in spite of much that is individually correct—to be regarded as operating entirely in a vacuum. In this respect the native and truly conscious artist has always proceeded in a racially formative way and has outwardly embodied truly spiritual qualities through the utilization of those racial types which surrounded him and which have become bearers of certain racial peculiarities. However much Hellas appears related to us in so many things, the Greek had a sense of things that is entirely different from our own Teutonic thought—or from the Roman or the Indian. This pattern of thought determined the rhythm of his life. This was an aesthetic value. Beauty was the measure of Hellenic life in the Symposium. Beauty was the all-motivating theme of the Iliad. The Greek search for beauty continued long after the decline of the world of the Polis. So strong was its search that when a poor disintegrated Greece faced a Roman general whose presence awoke a remembrance of its own former ancestors, T. Quincitius Flaminus was treated, because of his dignity and beauty, as a national hero. Athens celebrated him as one of its own great men. This was a mark of the profound Greek longing for the heights of life, even during decline. If we wish to understand Hellas, we temporarily ignore our own supreme value—character. A truly beautiful person could be honored after his death as a demi-God in Hellas. Even the half-Greek Egestans erected a monument to the man held to be the most beautiful Greek in the struggle against the Carthaginians and made sacrifices to him. Sometimes the Hellenes spared an opponent if he impressed them with his beauty. For such beauty seemed to them to be a share of divinity, godlikeness. Plutarch has left us a touching tale of such worship of beauty. Even the Persian general Masistios, killed by the Greeks, was, after his beauty had been observed, carried around by the Greek warriors for general admiration. The Greeks said of Xerxes that his beauty justified him on all counts as the ruler of his people. Outward appearance was—in spite of many bad experiences—regarded as the reflection of a noble soul. For the Greek the hero was always beautiful, and this meant that he was of a *racial type.*

The Greek as hero appears, for example, in almost the same shape, not only in Hellenic plastic art but also in petty art such as vase painting. With his slim body the hero simultaneously provides the type of ideal modern beauty, although in his profile the Greek is more gently formed

than the later Teuton. Alongside great Hellenic art, one must study the vase paintings of Exikias, Klitias, Nikosthenes, to observe how these show, for example; Ajax and Achilles at the games, Castor with his horse; the Hydrias of Charitaios with the Amazons; the blond wife of Euphronius on the Orpheus dish which is particularly reminiscent of Gretchen; the magnificent Aphrodite with the goose; the Napolitan Krater of Aristophanes and Ergines, etc. On thousands of vases and kraters we find a constantly recurring racial type which changes only a little here and there and clearly attests to the beauty and greatness of the Greeks and their excitement at what was heroic, beautiful and great. But a conscious racial contrast exists alongside this, for example, in the representation of Silenus, of satyrs and centaurs. Thus the (Inselionic) Phineus bowl contains three embodiments of masculine lewdness with all its attributes. The heads of the three are round and pudgy, the foreheads swollen as if with dropsy, the noses short and snubby, the lips puffy. This is exactly how Andokides describes Silenus, portraying him as hairy with a long beard and, in the profile drawing, the thick fleshy neck was also visible. The same type appears brilliantly represented by Kleophrades whose truly Greek Bacchante provides in figure and skull line a completely conscious spiritual-racial antithesis. Nikosthenes likewise portrays the wineskin carrying Silenus as a virtual half-animal, half-idiot caricature, while Euphronius has left behind a Silenus dish which ideally represents the snub-nosed, hairy negroid-eastern racial type. Evident, then, are these two great opposites; the slim, powerful, aristocratic Helene and the short stunted bestial Silenus who unquestionably belongs to the race subjected by the Greeks or to the types of imported slaves.

With increasing infiltration of Asiatic blood, figures also appear in painting which at twenty paces distance are to be recognized as Semitic and Jewish. A bowl of the Eos master, for example, shows us a Semitic trader with a sack on his back, while on the early Lower Italian Phineus krater, a harpy is represented so that its head and hand motions can be 'admired' *in nature* on the Kurfurstendamm today.

On thousands of vases and art objects ranging from Asia Minor to the wall paintings of Pompeii, the fact can be proved that, over the course of eight centuries, the consciously willed artistic and aesthetic impression of a hero or an ardently possessed man is conceived and represented racially. With the progressive bastardizing of the Greeks, "humane" misshapen figures appear with spongy limbs and ill-shaped heads. The racial chaos of a period of progressive democratization goes hand in hand with artistic decline. No longer did a soul exist which could express itself.

There is no longer a type which embodies the soul. Henceforth we find merely "the man of Hellenism," a creature who can have neither aesthetic effect nor an inspirational one, because the style-forming race soul of the Hellenes had died. Things degenerated to such a point that the blond haired Achaeans of Pindar formed something unique in the Mediterranean. From the beginning of the 5th century the treatise "Physiognomika" by Admantius, said of the Hellenes, that

> They were particularly tall in stature, with firm white skin and had well formed feet and hands, powerful of neck, with brown hair which was gently and softly waved. They had square faces, fine lips, straight noses and powerful eyes with a powerful glittering gaze. They were a people with the most beautiful eyes in the world.

Homer and his creations were also Nordic-conditioned like those in the plastic art of Greece. Telemachus tore himself away from his mother, "the blue eyed daughter of Zeus" who sent him a "favorable sailing wind." When Menelaus's destiny is foretold to him, he is prophesied a godlike life which will lead him "to the ends of the earth," to the Elysian fields where the hero "Rhadamanthus the bold" dwells. Only with a "head of golden locks" could Holderlin picture the genius of Greece. Homer, as a man conscious of his being a master, avows:

> For the resolute man always conducts best to a conclusion
> Every work, even if he approaches from afar as a stranger.

However, Thersites, a hostile, misshapen traitor, appeared to confront the "blind hero." Clearly Thersites was the embodiment of the Hither-Asiatic spies in the Greek army. These traitors were the forerunners of our Berlin and Frankfurt pacifists. Homer described the brothers of Thersites, the Phoenicians, as "swindlers, bringing with them countless trinkets in a dark ship." Thus, Homer created racial-spiritual art and, at the same time, gave birth to those images which were later set up in honor of the "blue eyed daughter of Zeus." He guided the brush of painters and gave a racial form to the alien anti-hero.

Silenus is not a "characteristically depicted thickset figure" as our art historians attempt to persuade us, but the plastic representation of the peculiarities of an alien race soul as this appeared to the Greeks. The emergence of the later Phallic cult and the debauched Bacchic festivals demonstrated the late Dionysian disintegration. This was caused by the emergence of the racially Eastern-Oriental types who had, heretofore, been regarded as dull and limited.

This adjustment of racial type is seen in the elephantine strength of Socrates. Plato glorified the hair-splitter. In the Platonic Dialogues Socrates declared that a written paper roll could entice him away from the most beautiful natural surroundings. In the midst of the extroverted Grecian world-view, this was an admission of the dullest pedantry, yet Socrates was an example of the spiritual-racial strength of genius. However strong his moral philosophy was, Socrates still failed in the field of aesthetics because of his insistence on universalism. In the devout and beautiful Greek life of old, struggle seemed to be an eternal natural law to the Hellenes in which Pallas Athens herself served. A new epoch of Greek history did not begin with Socrates but with him, a completely different man entered Hellenic life. Admittedly, he inherited the sacred traditions of Athens, of Homer, of the Tragedians, of Pericles and the builders of the Acropolis. Admittedly, he took part himself as a soldier in the struggles for political power, but, nevertheless, Socrates is the ungenial—although noble—brave man of another non-Greek race. He lived in a time when Athens had embarked on false paths wherein its once aristocratic democracy in which only Greeks, never foreigners, could participate, had begun its slide down into the abyss of chaos. Under the tyranny of the demogogues the great Alcibiades was banished and the entire Athenian army perished before Syracuse, and almost all other conquests were lost. the triumphant aristocrats then made the Democrats drink poison by the hundreds. Later, they met the same fate themselves. Aristophanes mocked ancient tradition. The new teachers, Gorgias, Protagoras, etc., took pride in the new, naked, beautiful forms. Then the alien man, characterized a thousand times in Greek literature, stepped to the fore. The new alien race unfolded its degenerate values, shaping Greek culture. The Greek values of sobriety and heroism were replaced. Socrates substituted dialectics for substance, the ugly for the beautiful, and academic disscussion for heroism. Beyond this, he sought "the good" in itself, preached the "community of the good" and gathered around him a disputing new Greek generation.

Once Pericles, as Lord of Athens, had to beg the court for its indulgence in granting civil rights to his son born of his foreign wife. This was granted him in an exceptional case. This strict racial law, made under Pericles himself, vanished with the progressive impoverishment of the blood of Athens. But it was Socrates, the non-Greek, who, in a time of decomposition, gave it a death blow. The idea of a "community of the good" resulted in a new human classification, not according to races and peoples, but according to individual man. With the collapse of Athenian

racial democracy, Socrates became the international Social Democrat of his day. His personal courage and cleverness gave his racially-destructive teaching its self-advertising blessing. It was his disciple, Antithenes, the son of a Hither-Asiatic slave woman, who then drew so many conclusions from Socrate's ideas and ventured forth to preach the destruction of all barriers between races and peoples in the name of human progress.

It was because of Plato that Socrates was immortalized and is, even today, honored by "armchair great men." Greek genius must recognize Plato as the man who, in the midst of a great decomposition, represented sober prudence. He loved this man, Socrates, and so, created an eternal monument for him. Plato placed the words of his own soul in the mouth of Socrates. Thus, the true Socrates vanished from the world. Only a few passages in Plato truly refer to him. In Phaedo, for example, Plato relates that Socrates had admitted that he possessed no aptitude for investigation of organic events. The true nature of things for Socrates therefore consisted ultimately not in their investigation by observation, but in our thinking about them. One should "not ruin one's eyes" by viewing things to excess. If man wishes to discover "whether the earth is flat or round" then "it does not suit him" to carry on research. Rather, he should ask, "What does reason say of this?" Is it rational to conceive the earth as the center of the universe? While Plato certainly invented this passage, it fits the same Socrates who turned his gaze away from a racially beautiful Greece in order to talk of a universal abstract mankind, a brotherhood of the good. Here he turned away from the sun of observation to look at the shadows of dogma. As the Jewish dogma has corrupted religion, so Plato's life-hostile "Scientific" method has corrupted European philosophy. Artistotle was its systematic diffuser and Hegel its last great pupil. "Logic is the science of God," said Hegel. These words are an affront to a truly Nordic religion. It is the antithesis of all that is truly German and all that was truly Greek. These words are truly Socratic. It is not surprising therefore that university professors have canonized Hegel along with Socrates.

Beauty of soul and beauty of physical appearance certainly do not always coincide. But with Socrates this was the case. Through an environment where Eros and the Nordic racial beauty of blond Aphrodite ruled, passed the same ideal of beauty, forming and shaping the real Greek world. The ideal was always the slim, white-skinned and blond creature—from Dionys of Euripedes to the "dear little blond heads" in Aristophanes, "Birds." In the midst of all this, the uncouth type of the satyr appears like the symbol of what is alien.

In the new, Asiatic-Greek world, beauty vanished. The ugly and all that is repellant to the eye replaced natural beauty in later Greek art. The preaching of the "rational-good" was the parallel phenomenon of Greek racial and spiritual disintegration. The philosophical-good then destroyed the racial-good as the idea of beauty. Heroic ideas no longer supported the state and social life. The greatest symbol of this new, hostile, racially unconscious chaotic group—the antithesis of the Hellenic race-soul—was Socrates.

Viewed from this aspect of historical development, such a genius as Plato appears to have squandered his entire spirit on this man and presents him with immortality. Plato was essentially an aristocrat, an Olympian fighter, a formative artist, and a profound thinker. At the end of his life he wished to save his people racially by enacting a powerful constitution. None of this was Socratic; it was the last great flowering of the Hellenic spirit. Praxiteles later formulated a protest against all Socraticism. This was the swansong of Nordic-Greek racial beauty. In art this was paralleled by the creation of the magnificient Nike of Samothrace. But Socrates remained a symbol of decline. Hellas disappeared in racial chaos. In place of the proud Athenians the universally despised Hither-Asians populated the provinces. The Greeks allowed these characterless racial inferiors to educate them. They drove the true Greeks away when they tired of them.

Socrates triumphed while Hellas perished. Healthy "human understanding" had destroyed genius in one last great hour. What was ugly became the norm; true beauty was only "the good."

When Socrates stood before his judges, he said: "Athens has never had a greater servant than I." The "humility" and "modesty" of the "messenger of the gods"—as he called himself—nevertheless had its other side. Socrates knew that Greece was disintegrating.

* * *

From the same spirit as Socrates once embodied, the Western "Aesthetes" of a "Humanistic" late period was also born. Like Socrates, they looked for the "Man," not the Greek or the Teuton, not the Jew or Chinese, they "discovered" so-called universal laws and preached of an aesthetic 'mood' and contemplation because the originators of these ideas had lost every sensitivity for the spiritual-racial will. In their enthusiasm for the Acropolis, our classicists forgot that here they were dealing with one side of Nordic man. Greek-Nordic man was not necessarily the

present Nordic-German man. Where the Greek-Nordic man viewed things formally and created separate works of plastic art, the Nordic Teuton created forcefulness of soul and richness of reference. Where the Greek turned racial-heroic motion into rest, the later Nordic brother, driven by another formative will, transformed inertia into movement. Where the Greek generalized, the Gothic and the Romantic man personified. The delightful, rustling lines of the three women on the gable of the Parthenon and the Nike of Samothrace nevertheless strike a special chord within us. The profound impression is with us today because we are witness to a spiritual-racial relationship laid bare. If the theoreticians of the 18th and 19th centuries had become conscious of this fact they would not have admired the formally competent but boring Lao Tse. He would not be the starting point of a "universal" aesthetics. They would not have made the formal aspect of the Parthenon into a measure of absolute judgement for art. They have even overlooked what was fullbloodedly created in Hellas. As a result, the artistic-spiritual evaluation of both Greek and Nordic-European art was falsified. So even today we see the figures of Hellas and Germania in false perspective.

Only for Aesthetes who carry on Aesthetics for the sake of Aesthetics and not for the sake of art and of life, is a line nothing other than a line, mere ornamentation. But for every artist it is—consciously or subconsciously—function, the carrier of an achievement. It is linked to a definite material. In mankind, the various racial types are the embodiment of definite spiritual essences which condition, spiritually and racially, the colored-linear totality describing them. When Velasquez wished to make a contrast to a tiny blond haired Infanta, he placed alongside her a "female dwarf," i.e., one of those bastard types with which Spain is overpopulated. Everything stunted and slavish on earth is perpetuated for eternity in art from Velasquez to Zuloaga in these wretched squint-eyed cripples. Sancho Pancha is the racial type of the purely dark Eastern man—superstitious, incapable of culture, unimaginative, materialistic. Such man is "loyal" up to a certain point, but mostly he is merely subservient. Sancho is not a "fat man," but a concentrated racial-spiritual entity. These "masters" also distort, in a tragi-comic way, our Nordic knights. Such mockery, under an alien sun, is a convulsive excess. Even today, in the ancient aristocratic circles of Castile, Nordic skin is held to be a sign of noble ancestry.

The contours of the "Greek" Silenus correspond to the drawing of the "Spanish" Sancho and the "Spanish" dwarfs. Beyond this we find the

carriers of the same stunted spiritual nature given similar shape all over Europe.

The peoples of the West are a consequence of racial mixtures and inferior systems of political education. Each of them, however, has received what is essential in formative State powers from the Nordic stratum, and, as a result, received the formative powers of the entire culture. Linked very closely with this fact is the determining Nordic ideal of beauty which often has great effect in regions where the Nordic blood has since almost completely been vanquished. The idea of the hero throughout the whole of Europe is to be equated with a tall slim figure, with bright flashing eyes, high forehead, with powerful, but not excessive, muscles. An image of the hero linked with an undersized, broadshouldered, bowlegged, thicknecked and low-forheaded man represents an impossibility even when types like Ebert have floated to the surface of life.

* * *

As we move to the post-Roman period, we find the racial art motif again. If one looks at the heads of the Staufer kings, the memorial at Magdeburg, the head of Heinrich II, one sees racial-soul art. Witness, again, the way in which Rethel represents the face of Charlemagne and the Frankian king's enemy Widukind. One reads what ancient France has to say about Roland, what Wolfram relates about Parsival, and he knows that these works represent, inwardly and outwardly, a close interweaving of the spiritual and racial. Again and again we see the Nordic racial form expressed as great art. However, a change in the type of hero as a form can be established. Earlier, the hero had personality and led his people into battle. The real person thus became a symbol in so doing. Today, another new dynamic has developed; the will of the great leader directs millions from the center. Accordingly, in art forms, the head alone is drawn into prominent position. This representation symbolically shows what is significant, what is essential, for Germanic man. The forehead, nose, eyes, teeth and chin all become bearers of the will, of the direction of ideas. The movement from the static to the dynamic is discernible here. At this point, Nordic-Western art separates from the Greek ideal.

Schiller once wrote: "In plain words, man plays only where he is man in the full meaning of the term and he is only a complete man, where he plays. . ." The unity of the material compulsion of natural laws and the spiritual coercion of moral laws brought two heretofore diverse worlds together, and, of this combination the first true freedom was born.

Animated by this spirit, the new art forms extinguished the features of the old ideal. Simultaneously, the will emerged. The new form rests in itself, a completely closed creation unfolding as if it were from beyond, from space, without investigation, without resistance.

Type-conditioned beauty as an external static of the Nordic race is what is Grecian while the racially peculiar beauty as an inner dynamic is the spiritual adjustment of the Nordic West. The face of Pericles and the head of Frederick the Great are but two symbols signifying the breadth of race soul—of a racial ideal of beauty.

It is shameful, but nevertheless a fact, that while there are numerous "aesthetics," the unavoidable prerequisites of aesthetics in general, the representation of the development of racial ideals of beauty, has not yet been written. Outlines in this respect are so far to be found only in H.F.K. Gunther's *Rassenkunde* and in Schultze-Naumburg's *Kunst und Rasse*. Laymen, scholars of art, indeed artists themselves pass through the galleries without truly seeing anything. They read European and Chinese poems equally without seeing the true essence of either art form, because they seek only universal laws. Nonetheless, and without recognition, the Nordic soul soars upwards. To experience this feeling one needs only to cast his gaze at one of the most dignified works of European painting, such as the Eyck Triptychon with the singing children. The Eycks repeat again and again and again the same ideal picture of Nordic man, from draft form to the soaring heights of their later works. Their work in inner form is the equal to our racial soul. The beautiful Nordic racial types are examples of Germanic racial beauty in its purest form. The Nordic ideal of man shows a deeply furrowed, manly countenance like the face of God. A similar spirit is shown in the Eyck heads in the Berlin museum. And, in reaching into the same depths, one sees that the God, through whom Michelangelo awakens Adam, is the same head of God seen in the Van Eyck work, although Michelangelo could not have had the slighest inkling of the Eyck creation. The same head appears—even if altered through spiritual tension—on the figure of Moses trembling with rage. To represent figures of high power was possible to the Netherlander as well as the Italian only if they used the Nordic ideal. Neither Jan van Eyck nor Michelangelo could embody their ideal of nobility, strength and dignity through a face of Jewish race. One only has to imagine a face with hooked nose, drooping lip, beady black eyes and woolly hair, in order to realize the artistic impossibility of embodying the European God through a Jewish head—let alone through a Jewish "figure." This one recognition alone should be sufficient to convince one of the necessity of totally

rejecting the inner idea of the God of Jewry which forms its essence with the Jewish exterior. Our soul has been infected by the Jewish spirit in this respect. The means for this were the Bible and the Church of Rome. With their help, the desert demon became the "God" of Europe. Whoever opposed this God was burned or poisoned. *Western man only saved himself through his art. In picture and in stone he created his own God, in spite of the tragic struggle. To realize an inner beauty in color and marble and to place this entire richness in the service of a spirit; to embody a God, indeed, as beauty, only the European artist has been able.* One need only look at Michelangelo's Sybylls, his Jeremiah, his slaves, his boys or his Lorenzo to encounter the Nordic spiritual-racial creed.

Virtually the same ideal of beauty was what guided Titian through his whole life. His *Heavenly and Earthly Love* (Sacred and Profane Love) and *Venus* (Berlin) gave us a type of woman. This is also shown to us in the women on the Parthenon gable who were also the women who once came with the Germanic conquerors over the Alps. Titian's *Flora*, his *Holy Family* (Munich) repeat the same language. Giorgione, as a fellow Venetian, created in his *Venus* a virtual classical work of Nordic female beauty. Palma Vechio, another Venetian, found pleasure in nothing so much as in blonde, blue-eyed, tall women, as in his *Three Sisters in Dresden*. This ideal beauty was so strongly stamped that dark women had their hair dyed blonde in order to appear beautiful.

Yet another great Nordic Italian must be mentioned here: Dante. His ideal of beauty is also Germanic-conditioned and finds perhaps its most direct expression in his *Stone Canzoni*. And when Dante meets King Manfred in purgatory he writes:

> I turned and looked him straight in the face,
> Blond he was, beautiful and noble of appearance . . .

From here it is only a step to Rubens. He admittedly over-emphasized the fleshly, but the structure of his women is nevertheless determined throughout by the Nordic racial type, which, as once in Greece, is placed in contrast to the short, bullnecked, low-browed, round-headed fauns.

Rembrandt was well versed in the Bible, or, more correctly, he read the Bible itself little, but studied the Netherland Volksbook the *Trouringh* by Jacob Cats. He held to its descriptions on almost all occasions and believed himself under an obligation to paint many Jewish heads in order to represent the Biblical stories "correctly." As soon as Rembrandt treated things seriously, he abandoned his interest in the Amsterdam

ghetto. The father of the *Prodigal Son* (Petersburg) was divested of all Jewish attributes. He is a tall, old, Nordic man with intellectual, kindly hands. The regularity of the Nordic-Italian artist was alien to Rembrandt as he did not seek to represent our thinking in atmosphere, tone color symphonies and mystique. Nevertheless, his *Christ in Emmaus* (Paris) is likewise of Nordic sensitivity as are the portraits of His mother (Petersburg). The splendid figure of the *Danae* shows that Rembrandt could not represent true beauty other than as it hovered before the soul of Giorgione. One of the most sensitive portraits by Rembrandt is called *Jewish Bride* and it is compelling to have to affirm that even here every feature of "Jewish beauty" is lacking, replaced by robust, yet tender, Nordic feeling.

Raphael's portraits not only show "manly beautiful, powerful figures," as our philosophers of art have assured us, but they are embodiments of the same Nordic race soul that we see in the youthful self-portrait by Raphael. A keen observer has correctly remarked that the Jesus child of the *Sistine Madonna* is "frankly heroic" in gaze and posture (Wolfflin). That is aptly expressed except that the fundamental ground is lacking as to why the apparent Jewish family had an heroic look to it. Here, only composition and color distribution, not 'inwardness' and 'dedication' are determining. These are the prerequisites to the success of a formative will, once again, the racial ideal of beauty. To see in place of the blond haired, lightskinned Jesus child a blue-black, woolly-haired, brown skinned Jew boy would be an impossibility. Equally, we cannot think of a Jewish *Mother of God* or saint, even if the latter had the "noble face" of an Offenbach or Disraeli. The medium of expression of our soul has always been our Nordic-racial art. It was the so-called "Christian" churches which first gave us the possibility for such expression. But it must be remarked that, in this respect also, everything great has been realized despite the ancient Biblical nature. A following of the "old Biblical spirit" through a literal embodiment in art would have awakened only revulsion and derisive laughter. Had we followed Jewish-Roman teachings of racial art types we would never have had the beautiful Madonna of Holbein in Darmstadt, Raphael's women or Botticelli's figures.

One can follow these examples through the entire history of Western art. Certainly there is often a mixture with other, Western-Mediterranean, Eastern-Alpine and Dinaric types, but, again and again, the Nordic racial beauty comes to the fore great and dominant, as the ideal and guiding star. Scarcely one in a thousand among us is shaped completely

in accordance with this ideal. The appearance of many often is not in accord with the hereditary picture. The longing, however, which created and shaped, sought always to review itself in the same direction. One needs only to look at the head of Leonardo Da Vinci, at the self-portrait of Tintoretto (Paris), the self-portrait of the youthful Durer. . .it is the same racial soul which we see confronting us.

The 19th century shows here, as in all things, a certain interruption since other problems—landscape, etc.—appeared in the foreground. In Germany, Uhde and Gebhard sought to continue in the sense of realization of Nordic beauty but they remained embedded in the past. They lacked the thrusting power of genius. Marees made efforts to adjust to the Greek form and tortured himself. In searching for beauty during his whole life he broke down—not surprising for he was half-Jewish. Feuerbach also tried while living in the south. He, too, failed despite his material. The emergence of the city accelerated the work of racial destruction. The night cafes of the asphalt men were turned into studios. Theoretical, bastardized dialectics became the accompanying prayer of more and more new "trends." We saw the racial chaos of Germans and Jews. Street families, alienated from nature, appeared on the scene. The result was Mestizo "art."

Vincent van Gogh, a broken man filled with longing, wandered forth to paint. He wished to return to the earth. His *Peasant Figure at Work* was really modern, the "heart of modern art which neither the Renaissance nor the Dutch school nor the Greeks could have done." He tortured himself for this ideal and vowed that if he had possessed the power earlier, then he would have painted "holy figures." These would have been men like the first Christians. Today he would perish with this idea. He painted without thinking. He painted without racial spirit. His insane choices included: cabbages, lettuces, seemingly in order to calm himself down. . .And Vincent painted apple trees, cabbages and paving stones of the streets. Finally he became absolutely insane.

Gaugin sought ideal beauty in the South Seas. He painted the race of his black women friends, melancholy nature, leaves rich in color and the seas. He too was inwardly disintegrated like all of those who travelled the whole world seeking a lost beauty, whether their names be Bocklin, Feuerbach, Van Gogh or Gaugin. Eventually, this generation grew tired of its search and gave itself up to chaos.

Picasso once copied the old masters with the greatest care and painted powerful pictures in-between—one of them hangs in Moscow—in order

to finally offer his *Theory—Illustrations* in bright and dark colored clay squares to a directionless public. The journalistic parasites seized greedily upon this new sensation, and grew enthused over a new epoch in art. But what Picasso still shamefacedly concealed behind geometric artifices, appeared openly after the World War with arrogant boldness. The mestizo claimed to represent in his bastard miscarriages produced by spiritual syphilis, an infantilism as the "expression of the soul." One should study long and attentively, for instance, the "Self portraits" of such as Kokoscha, in order—when confronted with this art of idiots—to grasp the horrible inner 'life' of it. Hanns Heinz Ewers tells a short story of a boy who was so unnatural of disposition as to take a special delight in people sick with elephantiasis. Our "European intellectuality" finds itself in an identical condition today which, through Jewish pens, worships the Kokoschkas, Chagalls and Pechsteins as the leaders of the "Art of the Future." Features of degeneracy are already apparent, as, for instance, with Schwalbach, who risks representing Jesus as flatfooted and bow-legged. Louis Corinth shows a certain robustness, but this master butcher of the brush also disintegrated into clay-corpse-colored bastardy a Berlin under Syrian influence!

Impressionism, orginially carried by strong painting talents, was once the battle cry of an all disintegrating intellectualism. The atomist's study of the world also atomized color. Natural science, dulled in understanding, found its outflow in the practicians and theoreticians of Impressionism. The mythless world also created a mythless art of sensuality. Men who wished inwardly to escape from this desolation collapsed. Van Gogh is a tragic example of unsatisfied longing gone insane. Gaugin is another tragic example of the attempt to make oneself free of intellectualism. Only those such as Paul Signacs went on painting, unhindered and unconcernedly pasting their color pieces together.

These men stood helplessly in their present. Their opponents, likewise without misgivings, had their backs to the future. The Homeric destiny which had once been promised to Bocklin had already been decided. To hang the *Isle of the Dead* upon one's wall today has become an inward inpossibility. The play of the nymphs in the waves forces a material upon us which we simply can no longer bear. The women with Grecian blue gowns under the poplars, along the dark stream; Flora striding through the field, the girl harp player on green earth—these are things which signify for us an artistic absurdity.

Bocklin's powerful originality is as it breaks forth eternally in his many works. But a generation of eclectics who, repelled by the atomistic teach-

ings of the 19th century, looked back at the 16th century, felt Bocklin in his very weakness to be a refuge of German fantasy. The efforts to preserve for us this side of his nature have been of touching loyalty. Excessive fantasy had, however, to a great extent, not mastered life but rather, it galvanized antique models. It has taken hold forcefully and in a deceptive move of the media of representation. Bocklin is most powerful when he abandons allegories. Today, we think with the same lack of appreciation for many classical attempts, just as we wonder at Jacob Burkhardt who, in all seriousness, made art evaluating studies on the basis of imitation of Renaissance buildings of his own day. Such men, who surrounded themselves with furniture and pictures of the "great times" which represented, in a magical way, the birth of modern man in the Renaissance culture, had not any really great incentive to bring about the rebirth of man. Even if they knew this intuitively, they feared a positive conflict with the impressionist *Zeitgeist*. They withdrew from life and practiced their talent on unfit objects.

The entire tragedy of a mythless time is also shown in the ensuing decades. Intellectualism was no longer desired. The endless color dissections were despised. Proper feeling led to a seeking for release, expression and power. The consequence of this great tension was the abortion called Expressionism. An entire generation cried out for expression but it had nothing at all to express. It cried out for beauty but it no longer had any ideal of beauty. It wished to reach creativity in life but it had lost every real formative power. Then expressionism became the mode and thus, instead of creating a new style-forming force, the downward trend continued. Inwardly undisciplined, "primitive" art was swallowed up by a corrupted generation. There was excessive praise of Japan and China and all serious European-Nordic art was attributed to Asia.

Great talents like Cezanne and Hodler were defeated in their struggle for a new style, despite all attempts by their pupils to cling to these two as the standard bearers of a new will and despite all attempts by literary critics to fabricate intellectual props under the effort.

Thus a beer cellar mysticism alternated with Cerebrism, Cubism and linear chaos, until people became tired of all this and attempted again—vainly—to escape with the "new wave of objectivity."

The essence of all this chaotic development lies in the loss of that supreme ideal of beauty which, in so many forms and strivings, has been the supporting foundation of all European art creation. The democratic, racially-destructive, doctrines and the Folk-eliminating metropolis united

with the deliberate Jewish work of decomposition. The result was that not only ideologies and ideas of state collapsed, but also the art of the Nordic West.

Here we have arrived at one of the profoundest criteria for every study of art, but one which all academic aesthetes have always overlooked; indeed they have hardly suspected it.

Aesthetics is, among other things, concerned with judgements of taste. It demands that a work of art should not only please one man but find "universal" recognition. The search for this "universal" law of taste has overheated heads for centuries. As a result, a prerequisite of all polemics has been disregarded: A work of art can only "please" if it moves within the framework of an organically bounded ideal of beauty. Kant gave the definition that, "Beauty is a form of purposefulness of an object insofar as this is viewed without the idea of its having a purpose." (*Kritik der Urteilskraft*, p.17) Here, Kant expressed a profound thought but he drew the mistaken conclusion that one must assume "a common aesthetic sense." This aesthetic sense rests on a purely human mode of perceptive powers, i.e., on the mental condition, and is universally communicable. With this, Kant deflected his search at a critical moment in a fateful direction. The beauty of the Venus of Giogione has effect upon us as unconsciously purposeful. Every other truly racial beauty, that is, beauty that is conditioned by an organic soul, has the same effect. As a logical conclusion from the first Kantian perception, we recognize that the demand for "universal validity" of a judgement of taste denies the possibility of a racial ideal of beauty. Therefore, it extends only to those circles which, consciously or unconsciously, carry within their heart the same idea of beauty.

Once we recognize this fundamental fact, we necessarily deny all prior aesthetic theories. Then and then only is the way prepared for a theory of the beautiful which finds the aesthetic related to the organic soul. We thus deny any atomistic-individualistic aesthetics.

* * *

In the effort to separate the aesthetic object from all non-aesthetic elements, the content is always separated from the form in order to obviate the eternal mingling of moral sermons and aesthetics. This necessary difference in methodology is not complete in itself. We must never overlook the most important of all things—the great spiritual content of

Nordic-Germanic art. The choice or separation of certain elements of spiritual content is for us a formative, entirely artistic, process. But since this was forgotten in face of the one-sided glorification—still falsely spread—of Greek art, an essential component of Western art has been allowed simply to fall to one side. Surprise should not be expressed if the average citizen then fabricates a "moral art" from what has been left.

This consequence appeared because the German aesthetes, fixedly staring at Hellenic art, declared that aesthetics is only concerned with beauty, that is, with the condition of easy freedom from moral necessities, mechanical pressure and spiritual tension. But this Greek beauty was only one—perhaps static—element of Hellenic life. However much we may debate whether it is architecture, sculpture, the epic or the tragedy which is the greatest legacy of Hellas, it is beyond doubt that inward and outward plastic art has been the beginning of the end of all Greek artistic activity. In Sophoclean tragedy this static plastic art is preserved. Even in the horrid works of Euripedes, destiny appears less an inward state and development than as an interweaving of incomprehensible conditions and outwardly destructive essence. This same beauty in the art was a sin against the spirit of Europe. Our art was from the very beginning not adapted to a beauty based upon plastic, but upon spiritual movement. This means that it was not the external condition that became form but the spiritual value in its struggle with other values or opposing forces. Through the choice of content as a standard giving impetus to the work of art, while conditioning its form, Nordic art is significantly adapted more to the personality and its enlightenment than was the Hellenistic. The highest work of Western art is therefore not what is most "beautiful" but what best penetrates to our spiritual being, our souls. It is this factor of strong inward motive power that does not belong to Greek aesthetics. Rather, it is embodied in the Nordic West as a problem of form and at the same time without relation to what is purely rational or moral.

As in many other cases, Schiller displayed the correct insight out of instinct and despite his prejudices for Greek art, although he did fail to draw the appropriate conclusions. He wrote:

> How much attention we pay in aesthetic judgements to power rather than to its direction; how much to freedom than to conformity is sufficiently revealed by the fact that we prefer to see power and freedom expressed at the expense of conformity rather than, conversely, at the expense of the former. Aesthetic judgement contains in this more that is true than one usually believes. Clearly, vices which give evidence of strength of will reveal a greater disposition to true moral

> freedom than virtues which borrow support from natural inclination, because it costs a rascal only a single victory over himself to turn all the consequence and strength of will which he wastes upon evil, to good.

These words proclaim openly one side of the explanation. Why for instance, are figures like Richard III and Iago able to have an aesthetic effect upon us? They have effect because of the power an inner law has upon us. Without that inner light we are tempted to make absurd moralizing judgements. It is the power of this inner strength which reconciles us with everything. However, this has been so not only since Shakespeare, but it has been thus since the beginning of German art. *The Nibelungenlied* is the result of the power of true creativity in Western art. This great story moves the soul and frees the spirit. Even in its poorest form it still shows perfected artistry of the highest order.

I know that objections will be raised against the comparison of *The Niebelungenlied* with the *Iliad* because the historical development of the Greek and German people were not "simultaneous." Nevertheless, a comparison is possible if one follows the eternal laws of form. If the *Nibelungenlied* is considered great enough to contrast with an artistic composition which is different from, but equal to, the *Iliad*, then we also find ourselves in disagreement with the Goethe who gave the assurance that one should not allow one's enjoyment of the great German Epic to be diminished by comparing it with the Grecian: "Too great a measuring rod" was brought away from Homer.

The *Iliad* and the *Nibelungenlied* are often enough compared with each other but only after long reflection by the Germanists and only after an opinion that was long in coming from the Hellenists. The result of such comparison hertofore has always been that the *Iliad* stood far above the German poem. The worst that could be said of the *Iliad* was that it was quite violent.

Today it is customary to reject these views which were born of a belief in the universal validity of Greek art canons. To admit that a work of art can present strong personalities means it was produced by a formative creative power of identical intensity. It is shaped differently from the Hellenic but it is equal to it, especially in artistic quality.

When we bring before our mind's eye the richness and living scuplture of the *Iliad*, the diverse ways, for example, in which Agamemnon stirred up his army leaders to battle and the recurrent descriptions of individual combats, then, by comparison, German heroic poetry does not seem so

well defined. The latter's technique is often clumsy. The descriptions repeat themselves here and there. These repeats are, apparently, later minstrel additions. The *Nibelungenlied* was never formally polished. Despite all this, the Nibelungs live, inwardly, a far more vivid life. Their deeds flow from the inward strength of will and struggle. They act according to an inner logic and a definite spiritual attitude. The interweaving of actions, born out of personal inwardness, intensifies the tragic contrast which leads to catastrophe.

From the start, it is naturally necessary to guard against the temptation of wishing to disparage Homer as a creative artist. He shaped a world of gods for the Greek people which set the pattern for hundreds of years of racial artistry. But Homer's artistic attitude did not correspond to our own nature. His figures moved in the middle sphere of the human. They did not descend to mysterious spiritual depths. They showed no longing for the ultimate heights. Actions were not formed by an iron will. The characters do not appear as expressions of the divine powers of will of man himself. They are, rather, determined by externals.

When, after a struggle lasting ten years, Troy had finally fallen, the cause of this conflict between peoples, a lady, was also freed. Helen appeared in the midst of the combatants. Homer did not describe her beauty. Rather, he paid more attention to the impression she made upon her surroundings. The warriors who lost friends and brothers, who had suffered a thousand privations—they all found that it had been worth the cost, to have shed streams of blood for this woman, for this beauty. Such an attitude is truly Greek: Whether Helen was inwardly worth being placed at the center point of a drama between peoples, is unimportant. It is probably the case that the woman probably had felt just as much at ease with Paris as in the King of Sparta's bed. No kind of sorrow about her fate is recorded.

A beautiful courtesan is thus the cause of war between two peoples. It is amazing that a woman was considered to be reason enough for war. Perhaps there are similar situations to be found eleswhere in history but here a poet uses this fact as the foundation for a powerful work. Thus, in the choice of spiritual content, he already reveals a creative form which is entirely opposed to our nature. The demon working within is lacking or is pushed consciously to one side. Form and beauty appear in its place.

Just as the smallness and seclusion of the Greek Polis allowed the ordinary citizen a clear vision of the conditions which determined his life without placing an unbalanced demand on his capacity of judgement, so the Greek spirit is also shown of clear capacity for demarcation in art. This

certainty of artistic aim is revealed just as much in Iktinos and Kallikrates as it is in Phidias, Homer and Plato. Nothing remains without clear outline, except that less is unexpressed, Everything takes shape—if one may so put it—in a concentrated form and clarified with an enlightening objectivity. Once this has been completely successful, then the Greek did not become tired of transforming endlessly the basic theme found in the most varied way. This is a peculiarity which Goethe often praised in his talks with Eckermann.

There is nothing more magnificent than the manner in which Homer elevates nature to an art form. We encounter no lengthy descriptions of nature. Rather he uses an "atmospheric" content, reflecting a mood, of the available material compressed into words. This wonderful, concise form used by Homer has been the magic with which he has repeatedly held the centuries under his spell. It dominates all his works and breathes in all the details. It is a thing of everlasting youth and ever present immortality.

Its uniqueness lies in its creative power of being able to look away from descriptions of nature, of immediately humanizing them, of bringing them closer to us through powerfully portrayed likeness. Homer always described the Achaeans themselves as "bronze amored." Achilles passed through his works as the "agile runner," Hector walked with his "bushy helmet" waving "before the gates of Troy;" Hera courted Zeus, the "fiery eyed" goddess. The Greek ships were exhaustively described by only two words: "Dark and arched." All this has an affect like the brush strokes of a great painter, who with one movement, compels the color and line of a creature onto the canvas. This is form in its highest perfection. This is the joyous message of the Greeks. If Goethe made up a composite word, for example, 'morgenschon' (in his poem *Heidenroslein*) —he used this form only once, then here the same artistic law is shown as that which formed the spiritual breath of Hellenic life.

The Germanic poet selected and shaped in a different way. The spiritual content (Gehalt) which is formed, is not the person but a personality developed and determined by will. External events are only an occasion for the expression and consequence of a character—not its cause—or of the complete embodiment of the inward direction of the human will. Honor and loyalty appear in all forms as the motivating force at the beginning of Nordic art. Gudrun is carried off like Helen but she does not surrender herself. She prefers service as a maid to a life in dishonor. Although Hartmut, in his manliness and knightliness, represented an

unequally greater, and more artistically based, cause for devotion than the sorrowful Paris. But beauty, and, above all, the pride and loyalty of the king's daughter, provided us with a satisfying artistic motif sufficient to cause the bloody battle on the Wulpensande to be fought. The tragedy of the Nibelungs is rooted in this inward justification: The inward character as the supreme value. If the personality of Siegfried had been portrayed as a good-for-nothing like Paris, the wifely love of Brunhilde would not have been comprehensible to us. Her demonic womanly loyalty would have been credible to none. None of us would find the betrayal not only of the brothers but of all Burgundians understandable, human or artistically satisfying, if the figure of Siegfried had been represented as the dying God of Spring, as a moon or sun god. At the moment when he appeared in a poem, as a personality he became *content to be shaped.*

If perfect geniality is to be embodied anywhere, then it is here. Wherever Siegfried appears, all hearts fly to him. Where he could help, he placed himself without hesitation, selflessly and trustingly, in the service of chosen friends. Through love he invites—by the manner of his wooing Brunhilde—guilt upon himself. And through this guilt he perishes.

His adversary, Hagen, is a mixture of avarice and unconditional manly loyalty, a figure who, in its giant schematic delineation, represented artistically, the strongest counterpart to the radiant Siegfried. He represented a type of unconditional courage which, in conclusion, thanks to Hagen's consistency until his death, reconciled us with much of what he had violated. The encounter of Kriemhilde with Hagen and Volker at the court of Etzel is one of the most dramatic poetic images which can be conceived. The night watch by the two companions and the song of the minstrel are examples of splendid, manly poetry.

With tragic necessity, the different natures conflict with one another, as guilt and expiation and give birth to new guilt, as honor fights against honor, loyalty against loyalty. This allegory embodies itself in a human character that is the powerful creation of Nordic-Germanic nature as it appears from the very beginning, larger than life, in Germanic art.

These forces, whether loving or fighting, are the material with which a great poetic synthesis has emerged. It is completely useless to debate how many hands have worked on the *Nibelungenlied* because it is clear that many poems have become one work.

The latest researchers assert that the figure of Rudiger was the final addition added by a fifth poet. Nevertheless, this one was a great artist. In the whole world of literature one will search in vain for a personality of such simple inner greatness as that embodied in Margrave Rudiger. One

is compelled to recognize the spiritual force and power that exist in this new character. Foremost stands the oath of loyalty to his queen, the pledging of his manly honor which must triumph over all other forms. He faced old friends, guests whom he has guided around the land and to whom he has guarenteed protection. He faced even the betrothed of his only daughter. So Rudiger took death consciously upon himself with an iron will, although, with the defenselessness of Etzel and Kriemhilde, a strong temptation still grew to break his word. The idea of honor became the force that motivated all his actions. One should also consider in this reference the figure of Achilles, one of the most glittering heroic embodiments of all times, but who, because of a personal affront, left his entire people without a leader. Consider then the Margrave Rudiger, who, before his battle to the death, presented his shield to an opponent in order to confront him in full armor. One can estimate the gulf which exists here between figure and content.

The souls of two peoples of a different type are at work, both of whom transformed nature into art. The one allowed its men to weep and laugh, love, hate and perform heroic deeds, but it did not make the will into an all-motivating power; it left out personality as the shaping phenomenon, and it applied all love to the outer world. With word or chisel, it created a wondrous weapon to convey beauty; on the other hand, Nordic art dipped into the profoundest depths of the human will and mustered all powers of the soul into an inward, artistically conditioned whole, without granting formal beauty the decisive weight.

Even the greatest works of men show a weak spot—even the *Nibelungenlied.* The relationship of Siegfried to Brunhilde was not so completely well grounded in the present version as it was in the old traditions. This relationship found its final interpretation in the Edda. The "Lay of Siegfried's Death" is one of the greatest expressions of Germanic nature. It is the song of love, loyalty, hatred and revenge.

One must cease regarding these poets of our very early history as clumsy verse-makers as is the usual case. Despite all the patronizing recognition by our experts on aesthetics, there are great characters in these poems. We must recognize these authors among the ranks of the world's greatest creative artists. Only an artist creates true characters, living personalities. Thus, figures which have remained a timeless allegory of our nature through the course of centuries, can only be the result of artistic genius and formative power.

Kein edlerer Held wird jemals auf Erden

Im Sonnenschein stehn als du, Siegfried, allein.
(No nobler hero will ever stand
in earth's sunshine than you alone, Siegfried.)

We understand Goethe when he says: "Homer writes with a purity before which one is awestruck,"—a remark which in fact refutes his other avowals about harmony. We believe we possess an appreciation of artistic self-control and of the epic greatness of Homer. We are correct if we think of the powerful creation of the *Nibelungenlied* as great art. If Homer has been recognized as one of the greatest artists of all times and of all peoples, then it is time also to think of the *Nibelungenlied* in the same way.

Thus, as allegories of volkish art, the two epics stand facing one another. One turns more toward the inner birth of clear form. The other wrestles with the tragic epic of spiritual struggle. Homer mastered the material, the poets of the *Nibelungenlied*—and the creators of all Germanic poems—the spiritual content. These different aims are conditioned by temperment and reflections. Great works of art of different cultures cannot be measured with one and the same standard. Therefore one needs different philosophies of art for each in order to do justice to each essential type. Just as one cannot approach Michelangelo with the standard used by Phidias, neither can one use just one standard when contrasting the Hellenic epic with the German.

We will enter into individual details later. Previous reflections, however, now lead to another fact which is not only universally overlooked by aesthetes, but which is flatly denied by them: The existence of the aesthetic will. The denial of such a will is perhaps the most shameful chapter of German aesthetics. There is a significant evidence to prove that European artists have struggled to achieve spiritual content and form. The professors of aesthetics have ignored this fact. It was a dogma that art was only concerned with "apparent feelings," a nebulous kind of beauty, rising, untouched by life, from the dusty studies of scholars. For the sake of morality the will was lined with a protective shield that protected it from such lunacy.

* * *

Richard Wagner wrote to Mathilde Wesendonck: "They know that those like us look neither to the right nor left, neither forward nor backward. Time and the world are indifferent to us and only one thing

determines us—the necessity for the releasing of our own will." Balzac confessed in *Cousin Bette*·

> Constant work is the law of art as of life, for art is idealized creation. The great artists, the complete poets, await neither command nor inspiration. They give birth today, tomorrow, always. From this follows the habit of labor, this constant knowledge of the difficulties which maintain them in permanent concubinage with the Muse, with the creative power.

Such thoughts, unfortunately, have not reached the ears of our philosophers of aesthetics. It is high time to establish the presence of the creative aesthetic will. It exists in both artists and those who comment on their art. In becoming aware of the choice of spiritual content, and in the longing of the will, the essence of the Nordic-Western concept of beauty is revealed. It cannot be understood through biology. It can only be intimated.

The essence of human existence is, bodily and spiritually, an ever-renewed assimilation of material penetrating from the outside and being manufactured by our will. The formative will and the spirit seize the environment and the inner world. Such a formative process is mostly done through perception, but it may also be co-determined by an act of the will, whether this leads to the saint, researcher, thinker, statesman or artist. Every form is a deed. Every action is essentially a discharging of will. Our research into the psychology of art is almost exclusively concerned with how we appreciate and how we contemplate art. They believe this research is proper and justified, but we know that we must go beyond their research if we are to uncover the artistic will. Before motor-sensory, emotional and intellectual influences of a work of art can be discussed, our point of departure must be clearly established.

The law of perpetual motion is valid not only in the physical, but also in the spiritual, realm. It appears to us as self-evident that the heroic will is restless and creates more of itself. Our scholars make special efforts to uncover the initial energy of a religious or political phenomenon. Huge volumes are written in order to link the thought structure of our times with particular thinkers of the past. This activity by professors of philosophy is, even itself, frequently regarded as philosophy, so important does it appear. Systems of aesthetics are also exactly investigated and documented. Art and artists have been almost completely forgotten in the process. A special aesthetics will have to be constructed for them which will study the Nordic West. It may gaze at the Southeast, or up into the

clouds and apply our standards of value to all European art.

What was it that drove Beethoven to rush around Vienna during a storm?—to suddenly stand still, forgetful of the world?—to beat out a rhythm with his fists? What was it that compelled the impoverished Rembrandt to stand at his canvas until he literally collapsed? What occasioned DaVinci to investigate the secrets of the human form? What drove Ulrich von Ensingen to make plans for his churches? Precisely, it was nothing other than artistic, aesthetic will. It is a power, which, alongside the heroic and moral, must be recognized as a primal riddle if we wish to move beyond the level of our high school teachers of aesthetics. Nowhere has the upsurge of the will in art appeared so distinctly as in the Nordic West. We must emphasize this with the utmost clarity because the great sinful act of the 19th century was in omitting this fact.

Inwardly, the Greek participated in an act of will at the hour of the birth of his art. There is a Greek legend which tells about an artist who loved his work so passionately that his love transformed dead stone into full-blooded life. The creed of a universally-shaping aesthetic will is laid down in this myth. The paintings on the Parthenon, Greek dance and the lost Greek music (from which all other "Muses" derive their name) made audible the thunder of the will much earlier than it appeared in our own times.

Aesthetic sensitivity signifies a feeling of joy. Aesthetic mood is contemplation devoid of wishes, devoid of desires, in which the pure subject of perception arises in unblemished objectivity. So runs Kant's and Schopenhauer's teaching of aesthetics. Ninety-nine out of a hundred philosophers of art have since written in the same way. Forming the basis of their judgement was the dogma which condemned our entire aesthetics to barrenness: The incredible assertion that an aesthetic will did not exist. Otherwise embittered opponents found themselves united with this. The fact is that behind every work of art, just as behind a religious creed, there is an active force at work. This fact has been generally overlooked. This absurd assertion by our aesthetes had reference to outlook, to ideas, to concepts, to dissections of the feeling of beauty. It ignored the fact that a shaping will lies at the bottom of every art creation. It is concentrated in the work and it necessitates a powerful action of the soul. Without such a will, all our other efforts are in vain.

In the realm of art we experience a development parallel to a religious outlook on the world. A race-soul instinct creates works of a gifted, uncaptivated kind. It takes a far-reaching hold on its environment, and autocratically alters its lines of power. When Wotan was dying and we

sought new forms, Rome appeared on the scene. When the Gothic had ended its lifeline, Roman law and humanist priests of art appeared who sought to cripple us by application of new standards of value. With the re-discovery of Plato and Aristotle, with the first discoveries of Hellenic works of art, the Nordic spirit, during a time of searching, seized upon the newly found art but with it also its late-Roman falsification.

We know that the ancient Greek ideal of beauty did not correspond to the Nordic, that it was predominantly the blood of its blood. Nevertheless, this Greek beauty was particularly an evidence of a sheltered culture. Among a divided, individualistic people, the Greek idea of art provided a certain stability, a common myth. Physical beauty has never been the highest value of the Nordic West as has the formative will which manifests itself as honor and duty (Frederick and Bismarck), as drama of soul (Beethoven, Shakespeare) and, as concentrated atmosphere (Leonardo, Rembrandt). This will in art, bristling with power, was presented in the 15th century with an aesthetic standard originiating from a completely different environment. The Renaissance shows the struggle between instinct and the new idea in art just as with the reformers in the religious domain. After the life-pulsating 16th century in North Italy and the penetration of the Baroque, the apparent highest Greek value gained more and more in importance. The results of research into Greek antiquities (gems, vases, various paintings and portraits) showed that they were made under the auspices of a "universal" aesthetics. Greek forms were evaluated as "purely human." Then arises the doctrine of "contemplation devoid of will" followed by the denial of the aesthetic will. The Greek mythos of harmony and willed repose overshadowed the Germanic instinct—the urge to powerful personal confessions of faith and the unleashing of will. This split has lasted up to the present and only modestly do new outlooks appear now and then.

Although our aesthetics had demonstrably drawn standards from Hellas, it proudly believed it could assume that its main features were universally "purely human." As in state of life, so also in academic art, two archetypes of cultural life were accepted: Individualism and universalism. This was a spiritual orientation which explained the ego and its interests as the starting and final point of thought and action and which also wished to arrange this same ego into the laws of "universality." The dangerous thing in this seemingly illuminating classification of types consisted in causing the "universal" to evaporate into the infinite. Universalism, only superficially splendid, led first to the international "World Church," to the "World State," and later, to the Marxist

"International" and Democratic "Humanity" of today. Universalism as a basic archetype of life is thus just as barren as individualism. The result, in the event of victory of one or other of these two outlooks on the world, must necessarily be chaos. Individualism gladly wraps itself in the universalist cloak which presents itself as good, moral and harmless. The matter is represented differently when both individualism and universalism are related to one another. Ego, race and people are the prerequisite of its existence. Each signifies the sole possibility of its secular salvation. But simultaneously, the "generality" which coincides with race and people, finds its organic limitation. Individualism and universalism are, for themselves, straight lines into eternity. Related to race and people, they are rhythmically flowing powers, alternating forward and backward, standing in the service of racial commandments, making creation possible. This universal dynamic interpretation of life must also find its counterpoint in the study of Western art.

In art, there are thus three organic prerequisites to this study upon which, in the future, all European aesthetics must be based if the latter wishes to be a serviceable link in the life of the awakening Nordic West. There are: The Nordic racial ideal of beauty; the inner dynamic of European art, hence, *content* as a problem of form, and; the recognition of an aesthetic will. These assumptions seem to lead us to discussions concerning the consequences of inward adjustment to the problem of art and to the popularized notion of Schopenhauer's teaching on the will. Until this is overcome, there can be no talk of clarification—not only in matters of art—and the essence of the aesthetic condition can be seen to be understood neither instinctively nor consciously.

* * *

II. Will and Instinct

Kant's words, now unfortunately reduced to trivality, that the starry heavens above us and the moral law within us constitute our existence without relationship to cause and effect, reveal a deep affirmation to a view of the world based on polarities and to a dynamic feeling of life. In reality, no true European has ever been able to exist creatively outside this basic presupposition, although in many, the longing for the elimination of opposites—for rest, for a static view of life and for monism—has been enormously strong. Nothing is more typical of this longing and nothing proves the impossibility of monism for us more clearly than the case of Arthur Schopenhauer, the Romantic who believed he could master the full-blooded dynamism of his nature with the 'Flexible sword of reason.' He broke down in the attempt. His explanation of the world as related to the will divorced him from the Indian thought which he believed he could equate with his own, even though the Indians did not regard salvation as an act of the will, but of cognition. Schopenhauer's powerful monistic attempt at a representation of the world as will and idea, however, disclosed a procedure, the knowledge and evalution of which is fundamental for our outlook on the world, and, no less, for our comprehension of the nature of our art.

Object and subject are necessary correlations to one another. Here is the point: The perception of a polarity. The point from which Schopen-

hauer proceeds. From here, he turns, on the one side, against dogmatic idealism which does not regard the principle of causality as a characteristic of man, but as an essential quality of the "thing in itself" which brings forth the object. On the other hand, he rejects that materialism which makes efforts to represent conceptual activity on the part of the subject as the result of forms and effects of matter.

It is the great fault of materialism that it proceeds from what is objective because the object is preconditioned by the subject and its forms of viewing things, and thus, is not an absolute. Equally well, one could regard matter as a modification of the perception of the subject. Thus Schopenhauer places himself between dogmatic realism and dogmatic idealism. He took his starting point neither from the subject nor from the object but from the "idea as first act of consciousness." He agreed with Kant's doctrine of the ideality of space, time and causality, as pure, i.e., non-empirical, categories of the mind which make experience possible. All his efforts in the first book of his principal work move directly toward proving this: That if one regards matter as a thing in itself and attempts to explain the subject from this, then flaccid materialism results. If, on the other hand, one sees the subject as an absolute, then idealism results. If one separates object and subject, dualism results. If one asserts that both are one and the same, Spinozaism results. All these are dogmatic outlooks, against which we only know object and subject as two correlates, i.e., being-object.

We possess two intellects; the understanding—the capacity for perception of the causal connection (which we have in common with animals)—and reason, the capacity for abstraction (which is given to us alone). The function of the understanding is the formation of perceptions—the activity of reason, in forming concepts from which develop our language, science and our entire cultural spectrum.

Reason is "feminine" in nature; "It can only give after it has received." This points to the basic dogma of the Schopenhaurian philosophy: Reason is a function of the brain. The world is unmasked as a "phenomenon of the brain." Thinking is thus a process of separation similar to that of the secretion of saliva.

The work of reason consists in providing knowledge of abstract judgements. "Knowing means to have such judgements in the power of its spirit for involuntary reproduction which have their sufficient degree of perception of any something outside them." The object is thus idea as it appears to us in the conceptual forms of time, space and causality. Everything is in these forms and everything comes through them. As a

result, the view of the world is strictly closed off and a loophole seems to have been left nowhere so that one might ascend or reach down to a primal ground. But Schopenhauer finds yet *another side* of the world. Surveying our reason, past and future, and the certain death of the consciousness, the question must be raised as to the whither and whence of man, as to the nature of time and the individual consciousness. Schopenhauer, who previously gave the assurance that the entire world was "through and through" idea, breaks out of his self-imposed limits.

> But what drives us to investigate is particularly that it does not satisfy us to know that we have ideas, that they are such and such and have a connection with this and that law of which general expression is each time the principle of causation. We wish to know the significance of these ideas. We ask whether this world is nothing other than idea, in which case it would pass over us like an insubstantial dream, unworthy of our attention; or whether it may nevertheless be something different, something in addition, and what this actually may be!

No one up to now has been able to give more than a purely negative answer, an answer which was completely abstract, devoid of content and limited—The Nus of Anaxagoras, the Atman of the Indians, the "thing in itself" of Kant. Schopenhauer now unveiled this "thing in itself" as the inner essence known to us in the most intimate way as the will. One cannot arrive at it from idea as it is far more than an essence and is fully alien to its laws and forms. The will can only be intuitively perceived. Man would like to regard the movements and actions of his body in the same way as the alterations of other objects in relation to cause, stimuli and motive. But he would only understand their effects as a connection to every other effect that appears to him with a corresponding cause. But this is not so for the word *will* gives him "the key to his own phenomenon, reveals to him the importance, shows him the inner driving force of his nature, of his activity, of his movements."

The subject is thus given its body in a twofold way: In the first way it is idea, object among objects. It is subject to certain laws. In another way it is revealed through what is "known" directly to each, which is what the word will describes. And, "Every act of the will is simultaneously an act of bodily motions, not as if the one may be cause, the other effect, but they are one and the same brought to consciousness in a diverse manner. The action of the body is nothing other than the more objective action of the will appearing in perception.

I perceive the will not as something whole and perfect but only individual acts performed in time. I thus cannot imagine the will. It is without time and space. It is independent of ideas. The will is not subject to the principle of causation. It is groundless. It has the same essence in all phenomena. According to Kant this all belongs to the "thing in itself." As such, it is free, yet, as a phenomenon, it is unfree, predetermined. Freedom thus lies behind us, never revealed in actions. It follows from this that our empirical character, as it approaches us in our actions, is unfree and unalterable. It represents the objective form of objects that are intelligible. The empiric character behaves to the intelligible as phenomenon to the "thing in itself." In its most profound form, the will objectifies itself in the sexual instinct, in an unconditional will to reproduce. It is an eternal wishing and striving which, after brief satisfaction, is driven anew by lust, following these devilish characteristics unceasingly and remorselessly.

Not only in man does the will approach us as the "thing in itself"; it is the driving momentum in the whole of nature. In fact, it objectifies itself most perfectly of all in man. If we observe the powerful, restless urgency with which the waters hasten into the depths, the persistence with which the magnet turns again and again toward the North Pole, the violence with which the poles of electricity strive to re-unite and which— particularly like those of human wishes—are heightened by opposition; when we see the crystal rapidly and suddenly shoot upwards, then it will—according to Schopenhauer—cost no great effort of the imaginative power, even from a great distance, to recognize our own nature, dimly and tacitly, but no less illuminatingly than the manner in which the first rays of dawn share the sunlight with full midday. That is the will.

Accordingly, there are various stages of objectification of the will seen in the forms of Plato. They are those middle sections which are inserted between the two worlds: Idea and Will. These two forces establish an otherwise incomprehensible mutual relationship. Thus it is a plurality without a principle of plurality. At the lowest stage, the universal forces of nature—gravity, impenetrability, rigidity, elasticity, electricity and magnetism—display themselves. They are also, like our own will, groundless, and, like the letter, only their individual phenomena are subject to the principle of causation. They are *Qualitas occulta*. At a higher stage of the objectifications of the will we see the individuality appear more and more with man and beast, chiefly with the former. It is here that the essence of the universe is revealed. The struggle for existence causes the will to make itself manifest.

The universal struggle in nature is visibly revealed in the animal world which has the vegetable world for its nourishment and, in which, in turn, every animal becomes the prey and food of another. An animal can only maintain its existence through the constant elimination of a stranger—so that the will to live, without exception, consumes itself . . . until, at last, the human race regards nature as a product for its use. Fearful and insane is this power which—through so much diversity and expenditure of strength and so much feeling of sexual happiness, cleverness and activity—has only an ephemeral and fleeting feeling of happiness in copulation and the satisfaction of satiation to offer as a counterbalance. Effort and reward stand in no direct ratio to one another. Everywhere, Schopenhauer sees "universal" privation, ceaseless effort, constant pressure, endless struggle . . .

Only a blind will could find itself in such a predicament. In inorganic nature the entire struggle proceeds of its own accord. This struggle is based on the unalterable laws of cause and effect. In the plant kingdom, movements follow stimulation, i.e., causes call forth effects which are not identical. Finally, motive and perception appear as conductors of our animal actions. All this occurs legitimately. No place is left for freedom of reason. Reason and ideas are "subordinate organs."

Perception of both intuitive and rational types, emanates from the will at the higher stages of objectification since man necessarily needs capacities other than those of an inorganic nature. It is thus originally placed completely in the service of the will, although very great men are able to withdraw from this yoke. Perception functions solely as a "clear mirror of the world."

The world as idea has sprung from the will! In spite of Schopenhauer's initial reservation against asserting a causal continuity; here causality appears, even if cloaked. The results are as follows: Reason is only a reflex, i.e., it is a "feminine capacity" through and through. It is conditioned by the notions which are determined necessarily through perceptions. Reason is thus uncreative. We are unfree. Our actions are necessarily determined through motives, be they actual or imaginary. Our "intelligible character" is shaped behind men. This character lies outside of necessity. It is innate in life and it is unalterable. Thus it is subject to the principle of causation.

Our reason, underdeveloped and captive though it may be, may elevate itself and conquer our "demonic will" through an "excess of intelligence" as a potent "subject of perception." We may overcome the fearful power of the will.

We see this in the genius of the true artist, who, freed of his will, is able to represent pure nature objectively. It occurs as well in the phenomenon of saintliness, a condition in which reason is successful in transforming passing aesthetic forgetfulness into permanent will-less contemplation. The saint sees through the illusion of the world and denies the will to live.

The end of man, despite his efforts and torments, is nothingness. Schopenhauer wrote:

> Before us remains, at all events, only nothingness. But that which strives against this dissolution into nothingness, namely, our nature, is indeed only the will to life . . . But if we turn our gaze away from our own need and look to those who have overcome the world, those in whom the will arrives at full self-knowledge, then we find only a transition from wishing to fearing to the unknown. Instead of unsatiated hope we find peace which is higher than all reason. A total oceanic calm of the heart such as Raphael and Corregio represented. Only perception is left, the will has vanished. But we then gaze with deeper and more painful longing upon this condition, alongside which our sorrowfulness and hopelessness, by contrast, appears fully exposed. Nevertheless, in the final analysis, contemplation is the only thing which can console us. If we, on the one side, suffer endless sorrow and enduring lamentation as the phenomenon of the will of the world; and on the other side we are able with elimination of the will, to see the world dissolve and only empty nothingness remain before us, we shall accept it willingly. What remains after total elimination of the will, for those who are still driven by it, is obviously nothingness. But conversely, to those in whom the will has turned away and has denied itself, this apparently real world of ours with all its suns and milky ways—is nothingness.

* * *

It does not fall within the scope of this book to discuss Schopenhauer's entire philosophy but only to emphasize those points which might be helpful for a judgement of the laws of life as they are expressed in ideology, science and art.

The central notion of the Schopenhaurian philosophy, the will, must be singled out at the start. It is represented as what is known and what is given to each of us directly. But if the word *will* is spoken, then in the consciousness of every mind still not hypnotized by Schopenhauer, there appears "in the most intimate sense" the familar principle beyond interpretation which, despite inborn egoism, often speaks within us. It has,

many times in the history of peoples, produced indescribably powerful figures. We think of the spiritual power of the German mystics, such as Luther; the dedicated lives of many men fighting for an idea; the figure of the overcomer of the world from Nazareth—in short, all the personalities who have represented free will as opposed to tyranny. We may think of them when we seek the essence within us, which is described by the word *will* and is said to be known to us "in the most intimate sense." But the more we read of Schopenhauer, all the more does it appear that this idea of the will must be false and childish. In fact, the will is completely different from all other phenomena. It is groundless and mysterious. It is a powerful and aimless urge which stumbles from desire to desire. It is alive within man and beast. It is revealed in plant and stone. It causes the water to thunder down the rocks. It causes the magnet to draw iron and the plant to shoot upward. It causes a man to be attracted by a woman and one creature to destroy another.

The will, then, which is assumed to be a unity, forces its way through a proliferation of ideas into a diverse physical world. It calls forth its objectification and "kindles" at its highest stage "a light"—the intellect—which is completely dependent on it and born to its service. It looks in all directions for reward, always showing obedience to its master. It outlines the world as idea. We experience the strange fact that the brain—which is the prerequisite for the ideas of time and space—arises in time and space, so that it is simultaneously both subject and object of idea. This recalls the old riddle as to which came first, the chicken or the egg.

Schopenhauer actually completed his philosophy in the first book of his principal work. He showed there that everything could be reduced to idea, that all time, space and causality had the conditional prerequisite that we are completely unfree. He left no door open to the reason, that "subordinate organ," and restricted its entire capacity to idea. As a result, all his later philosophy follows this doctrine.

But the will, which otherwise so purposefully calls forth its objectivity, (why it does so remains an eternal secret) committed an indiscretion which is all the less understandable as the assurance is expressly given that the functions of the body are everywhere measured throughout by the will. The brain is provided with an "excess" of intellect. Some men suddenly rebel, abandon this "thing in itself" and see through the disastrous will and then exist as pure subjects of the perception creating eternal works of art, becoming saints. We do not know the origin of the power of the tertiary organ, the intellect, to suddenly enforce obedience

upon its invincible tyrant, the will. We do not know, but without his assertion, the disciple of Schopenhauer does not agree unconditionally to objectification of aesthetics, ideology, etc.

What is essential above all is the recognition that the phenomenon of having linked the natural and metaphysical into a uniform monistic system has been made possible here with the interplay of two completely different interpretations of what is to be understood by will. I have not found this idea expressed adequately anywhere. Admittedly, Rudolf Haym, in his study of Schopenhauer, very energetically rejects the will as the principal explanation of nature. J. Volkelt elaborates the contradiction in the interpretation of will but wishes to uphold the supremacy of the will. K. Fischer is woefully inadequate in his explanation of the will. Houston Stewart Chamberlain completely rejects the doctrine of the will (falling into another extreme). It seems to me that universally too little weight has been placed on the dual use of the term.

Some years before publication of his principal work, Schopenhauer had regarded the will as something great and holy. He says this, "My will is absolute, standing above all corporeality and above nature. It is holy in origin and its holiness is without limitations." But later his idea of the will recognized its metaphysical power. The will took on shimmering colors and, like a chameleon, it was blended in permanently throughout Schopenhauer's entire work.

Schopenhauer is of the opinion that it is for acts of the will that we are responsible for that which we can alone be made responsible since the intellect is a gift of God and nature. The will is used here in the sense that is directly contrary to the will as it ordinarily appears in Schopenhauer. Normally it is an aimless and unalterable egoistic instinct.

When Schopenhauer sets up the world as a purposeful whole in which everything relates to everything else in an "incomprehensible harmony," this again does not agree with the concept of a blind will. His expedient qualification that the will is, in fact, irrational, yet acts "as if it were rational," is far too unsatisfactory.

If ideas are to represent stronger or weaker objectification of the will, then a measuring capacity will be attributed to an aimless entity insofar as the more it grows objective, the more differentiated it becomes.

Any teleological version of nature is abandoned in Schopenhauer's system. I understand a human action as such only when I realize its purpose, that is, only when I presuppose creative will striving for an aim. But if I see nature as striving constantly for aims as much unconsciously as purposeful, then I presuppose an ordering principle, irrespective of

how it was created, in advance of any insane, blind, aimless will.

One thing must be understood clearly. With the one word *will*, two fundamentally different concepts must be described. The one alludes to a principle opposed to the whole of nature with its striving directed solely and simply at self-preservation; the other characterizes the essence of egoism. In short, we must distinguish will and instinct. Will is always the opposite of instinct and not identical with it as Schopenhauer seemed to teach. The difference between will and instinct is not quantitative but qualitative. If I feel that here Schopenhauer was right—that an animal lust directed completely at the senses and subconsciously appearing within the circle of consciousness, unassailably dominates and reveals its entire purpose particularly in its existence and its assertiveness—so can I, if I am a poet, also conceive a similar instinct in the plant and mineral realms.

I cannot make poetic analogy into the foundation of a philosophical conception of the world. I cannot do this rationally either without being caught up in a vicious circle. I am forced to establish that the other factors work against desire, other factors that embody other principles. Reason is co-extensive and co-terminous with this principle. It alone can overcome the yoke of blind instinct. It must be partially or totally conditioned through the brain but it is not produced by it. An organ simply cannot conceive itself.

I am forced to admit that my will is divided into two parts: sensuous-instinctive and super-sensuous-willed. These are the two souls which Faust felt within his breast. Only a blind dogmatism can represent these two separate principles as one and the same. If Goethe heard "completely softly, but very perceptively," a voice which told him "what was to be done," and "what should be avoided," then it was passion which forced him into the opposite direction. The moral side of man accordingly rests upon a categorical moral law which rules within him. Otherwise, moral prayers would be a source of laughter and both Christ and Kant would seem to have been really stupid men. *Must* and *Can* (Sollen und Konnen) presuppose each other. Without freedom there is no feeling of responsibility, no morality, no spiritual culture.

In conclusion, Schopenhauer turns himself upside down. If instinct—which stirs so powerfully, discerned by the tertiary reason—suddenly whispers softly and begins benignly to purr, then this is a consequence which much have caused him headaches at times. The 'flexible sword of reason' cannot solve world conflict through cognition alone. Either one proceeds from the factual and recognizes the possibility of victory of the

will over instinct, or one makes a violent sweep and declares the whole world to be unfree and, as a result, gives up every possibility of purification. The former is the viewpoint taken by Christ, DaVinci, Kant, Goethe; the latter is that of the Indians and Schopenhauer. But the latter somehow allowed a single appearance in the world of freedom as the "sole exception." The "Thou shalt," over which so much derision is generally unleashed, appeared in conclusion as *deus ex machine*. A moral power suddenly appears in chaotic, aimless instinct and the moral world order, upon which Schopenhauer justifiedly lays much weight, was saved. Otherwise, Schopenhauer's original will recognizes only the physical, not the moral, sphere.

Thus Schopenhauer, when he teaches the denial of the will, also includes the denial of instinct and affirmation of the will. But this is an illogical aspect of the whole system and it tears it apart completely. What Schopenhauer taught, with zeal and energy, was that instinct formed the essence of the universe and of man and that it was identical with the will. What he admitted with joy but which was incompatible with his system was that the will is, at the same time, morally redeeming, that outside instinct and tertiary understanding man still represents something quite different. The moral will, as it appears in the last book of the *World as Will and Idea*, denies the entire teaching of his first books and Schopenhauer later admitted in a letter, when pressed by troublesome inquiries that "the matter was naturally a kind of miracle . . . "

This compulsive monistic view of the world is torn apart and no amount of time will bind it together again. What Schopenhauer said later about individuality being rooted in the thing-in-itself and its transitoriness, is beautiful and does all honor to his overcoming of self, but, however, it does not accord with his everlasting derision about self. He says, " . . . it follows that individuality does not rest solely on the principle of individuation and is therefore not mere appearance. It is rooted in the thing-in-itself, in the will of the individual, for a man's character is, itself, individual. But how deeply the roots go, belongs to questions for which I do not accept responsibility." (Letter of March 1st, 1859). So writes the man who claimed that he had found the "philosopher's stone" and the principle of world unity, and who despised everyone who did not unconditionally concede that this was so.

If instinct, veiled as will, is to represent a principle of "unity" then it is not the unity of the entire man but only one aspect of him, the natural. Schopenhauer undertook to carry this through in a brilliant manner. That he interpreted instinct as the predominant principle is not materialistic

but it is certainly naturalistic monism.

Comparisons are often made between a man and his teachings. We frequently discover glaring contrasts between the two. It is true enough that this man who in all seriousness regarded himself as the founder of a religion and preached denial of the world, lived a seemingly comfortable life as an established patrician. He was afflicted with a grotesque anxiety about his health and well-being. Because of an unpleasant dream and out of fear of cholera, he left Berlin. He lived in Frankfurt on the ground floor of a house so he could save himself quickly in case of fire. When visiting, he always carried his own glass with him so that he did not expose himself to the dangers of infections from dirty cups. Here, his own "will" makes its appearance with a vehemence amounting almost to sickliness. Schopenhauer was possessed by an almost demonic fear of death. He was also possessed by a brutal egoism and filled with a fury when anyone opposed him. He was, at the same time, a world-wide intellect in whose inspired insight and illumination of spirit thousands of spiritual revelations were captured. He had an amazing insight into many problems and wrote in a German style of splendor, color and clarity as only a few among the very great can.

On the other hand, he had only rarely felt that "quietly perceptible voice" of which Goethe and Kant spoke. It appeared merely as an indefinable longing. He was unable to grasp the subtlety of Schleiermacher or the greatness of Fichte. He was oppressed and stifled by a boundless presumption and spoke only with malicious delight about the weaknesses of those he encountered in life.

The description of a man who cannot be compared in some clever book but is an image of nature with all its contradictions suits none better than Arthur Schopenhauer. Certainly, the contrast between instinct, insight and will was seldom concealed so widely in one heart. At an advanced age he noted with satisfaction that his sexual instinct had weakened and from then on his words about fame noticeably diminished in favor of a fundamental pessimism. At age 70 he wrote, "The fact that the Old Testament sets life at from 70 to 80 years would trouble me little, but Herodotus also says the same in two passages. There is more to it. Only the Holy Upanishad says twice: 'The life of a man is 100 years' . . . that is a consolation."

Schopenhauer had earlier deeply felt the inward conflict of his two natures. His principal work was not written—as many superficial philosophers assert—by an onlooker at the theatre of life, as a participant in the grip of a demon. Otherwise with his intellect he would easily have

discerned the discordant parts of his work which were, in fact, the reflection of his real experience. Since Schopenhauer often felt himself writhe in the thrall of a powerful instinct, so the surrounding world also seemed to him irrevocably given up to this. As he saw his own intellect expand, so he allowed the yoke of instinct to be theoretically stripped away from his path. Just as he himself possessed only a powerless feeling of foreboding as far as free will was concerned, so the moral order of the world only made a shameful appearance at the end. Schopenhauer preached as man's longing that the recognition of instinct could alone lead to its overcoming. But he himself, in spite of all insight, was unable to realize it. If such an intelligence as his could not achieve this, then his imposing personal creed, the *World as Will and Idea*, is automatically self-judging. Schopenhauer had not seen or, from sickly adherence to a dogmatic outlook, had not wished, to admit that even a theoretically profound philosophy cannot on its own help abate the appearance of a factor over which all truly great men have been disposed: the will mastering or overcoming impluse. If Buddha recognized instinct as bringing suffering, then this is only one side of a man's nature; but when he conquers it through vital action, then the act of willing is the other. If Christ acted against the 'generation of vipers,' if he took death upon himself for the sake of an idea, then this is the effect of a principle of freedom opposed to the mere life instinct which no argumentation can abolish and which is certainly founded on instinct alone.

"The independent conscience" is the way Goethe understood it—"making its appearance like a moral sunrise," a principle which Schopenhauer believed he had overcome while he smuggled it into instinct in order to then allow both to shine through.

The philosophy of Arthur Schopenhauer is a vessel filled with precious things which is held together by the iron hand of a robust individuality. Now that this stricture has burst, all parts, beautiful as they are, lie scattered among one another. His personality did not suffice for a perfectly rounded work and his philosophy was the tragic dream of a despairing seeker. The will, in whose splintered assertions and upon whose occurrences the "genial world spirit plays its ingenious melodies," can only be genial itself. But the will, which to him is only a groundless, aimless, blind urge, is a purely animal instinct. The former is a value-creating principle; the latter is uncreative, destructive. The former reveals to us the positive in human nature; the latter reveals the negative side. All great artists and saints are filled by the first. They have formed it in practice as a work of art and as life. Through it and through reason,

with its formation of ideas, it has directed instinct into paths where it found its allotted place as a material of creativity. Arthur Schopenhauer also wished to take this path and failed because his intellect lacked the will. This is the tragedy of his life and work. As such a tragedy, Schopenhauer will always be accorded our respect, but, as the example of an heroic—in its powerful, truly European—struggle for the essence of this world he gambled everything on one card and failed. But Schopenhauer, when completely divorced from Indian thought, admitted that the highest a man could attain was an "heroic course of life." This is a particularly Nordic creed such as cannot be more beautifully found elsewhere. Therefore, Arthur Schopenhauer belongs to us.

* * *

This critique of Schopenhauer's philosophy seems particularly important for what I wish to say in this book. Today, his writings are found not only on the tables of professors, but also upon those of businessmen and, thanks to their glittering style of persuasive art, have found their way into wide circulation. The notion of "will" is, as a result, current in all places and is certainly now mostly regarded in the Schopenhaurian sense as a blind urge even if another interpretation unconsciously accompanies it. It is necessary to subject this conception of the will to a brief investigation and to reveal its self-contradiction or, to interpret it as instinct and nothing else. The will must be grasped in its original purity as a principle of freedom working against egoistic impulses, as Kant and Fichte believed, if one wishes to clearly re-establish a foundation for a Nordic vital feeling. But this critique is also of fundamental importance to the understanding of European art and its spiritual effect. If I speak of a view of art which does not reject the will, then I do not wish to maintain the impossible assertion that art must have effect upon impulse, instinct, upon Schopenhauer's 'will', but that works of art and, especially, a definite group of them, do not turn toward the subject of perception immersed in contemplative mood but aim particularly at the awakening of a spiritual activity of a will.

One of the most important insights into the nature of everything human is the recognition of the fact that man is a creature that shapes. At the basis of all his spiritual and rational activity lies striving for change. And only in this manner can he gain power over his environment, and grasp it as a unity. He also uses his powers to form his own inwardness, projecting this outward as religion, morality, art, scientific ideas and philosophy. Five propensities live in man; each demands an answer. In art he

seeks outward and inward form; in science, the truth in correlating judgement with natural phenomena; from religion he desires a penetrating super-senuous symbol; in philosophy he demands harmony of willing and perceiving; in morality he creates for himself the necessary guiding principles of action.

Each time a man enters one of these five regions another formative and active will makes itself known. This striving of will and perception is not to be discerned from the whole of nature. There are tendencies which face instinct and its satisfaction either indifferently (science, philosophy) or draw both into the realm of their formative activity. One must distinguish between these different attitudes of spiritual power which go back to reason and will and unite in the soul, in personality and which signify the *mythos* of a race. The differentiation can be performed naively-unconsciously or philosophically-consciously. In whatever manner and from whatever colorful emphasis of individual inclination this proceeds, it depends also on the multifariousness, the rich diversity of a culture as the expression of a race of definite soul.

* * *

III. Personality and Style

Space is simultaneity: the essence of time is a sequence. Space is only conceivable as rest; time measurable only by motion. A static artistic soul will therefore always prefer the spatial arts and emphasize a spiritual juxtaposition to the other arts more than sequence and separation. Again, a dynamic creative power will seek to realize all qualities of external and inward motion in its art, that is, to master the arts of time (music, drama) and also represent development and growth in the spatial arts. It will make efforts into one moment. Therefore, for example, the painting of the West is in the first place, portraiture. This signifies that the highest inward motion must be charmed into a necessary spatial form: the dynamic of DaVinci and Michelangelo was so shaped, and such a dynamic is always to be equated with the unleashing of will.

These reflections are fundamental for grasping the essence of antiquity and of the past in general. If one has recognized that Hellas was artistically static, then Europe represented a dynamic art-will. The consequences of this different spiritual orientation were two types of style which I wish to call "Objectivity" and "Personality" style.

Every serious student of the laws of art has seen himself compelled to recognize at least a duality of creation. As was established in a discussion of the Schopenhaurian notion of the will, the latter's metaphysical doc-

trine was shattered by an unnatural mixture of two tendencies in the act of willing. Instinct and will oppose the intellect on a common front; in fact, both are a form of willing but in divergent directions. Artistic creation as such is admittedly always a free style, but here a primordial formative will separates artists into at least two groups according to strength. This is not a new discovery. One kind of art has been called Apollonian, the other, Dionysian. These terms attempted to describe both differences in mood and differences in style of artistic creation. But it was basically false to transfer these concepts, inseparably linked with the Hellenic spirit, to the art of other peoples. Nordic-Western art is never solely Apollonian, i.e., serene, balanced, harmoniously-formal, and never solely Dionysian, i.e., solely sensually excited, ecstatic. One cannot even find the German words to capture the full spirit of Hellenic art. A German must personally view Kallikrates, Phidias, Praxiteles, Homer and Aeschylus, the Greek ancestral cults and Bacchic games, grave memorials and beliefs in immortality, in order to grasp what the Apollonian and Dionysian styles intended to convey.

Schiller attempted to interpret the duality of art creation (restricted solely to poetry) as naive and sentimental. As a result, he strayed down many a blind alley and was compelled to describe both Homer as well as Shakespeare as naive poets. His acute understanding, however, saved him from a complete impasse. Even if he held firm to the rigid dogma of aesthetic contemplation in each of his essays, there is nevertheless rooted there a quantity of sharp observations which reveal our essential Nordic nature. Every German ought to be familiar with his *Aesthetic Letters, Concerning the Naive and Sentimental Art of Poetry, Concerning Charm and Dignity, Concerning the Pathetic, Thoughts on the Use of the Common and the Base in Art*, etc.

The customary division into an idealistic and naturalistic style is neither formally enlightening nor otherwise revealing. Germanic art has always been both. DaVinci, who recommended that his pupils even study the dirty marks on a wall and who, at the same time, drew the head of Christ and Durer; who with microscopic faithfulness painted a tiny hair or the wing of a bird, created *Death, Knight and Devil*, and the *Little Passion*— both were 'idealists' and 'naturalists' simultaneously. Rembrandt was not frightened away by a description of human bestiality, yet he created *The Prodigal Son*. Gruenwald spares no representation of tortures while alongside this he also painted the *Resurrection*. Goethe wrote *The Blocksberg Witches Sabbath* and the *Chorus Mysticus*.

European art was never 'idealizing' in the saccharine sense familiar to us. It was never anxious to avoid or to soften nature. The formative path of Western artists lay far more through nature and before nature was finally surpassed, it had been given ruthless expression.

It was not an ideal of harmony-beauty in the sense of antiquity which prevailed in Europe, but the ideal of a new aesthetic will ruthlessly embodying itself.

If he wishes to reveal the nature of our art one cannot write a mere philosophy of the beautiful and harmonious. He cannot apply the standards learned in antiquity. The concept of the beautiful must—in order to be used generally—receive an enlarged meaning. For us what is 'beautiful' in the Nordic racial ideal must consist in the inner radiance of a meaningful will working on material things.

The beauty of the *Ninth Symphony* of Beethoven is fundamentally different from the beauty of a Greek temple. Rembrandt's head of Titus (in Petersburg) reveals a different kind of beauty of the soul than the Apollo of Praxiteles.

Greek beauty consisted in the shaping of the body, while Germanic beauty consists in the shaping of the soul. The one signifies outward balance, the latter inward law. The one is, as a result, an objective; the other is a personal style.

The descriptive term "typifying and individualizing style" has often been used. Since research is usually not carried out more far-reachingly, then one may be of the opinion that the artist looked more away from incidentals and saw only the great features of character. The individualizing artist particularly loves such whims and personal peculiarities. Through observation the problem of style is only grasped as a method and not as an artistic necessity. One can read page after page on how one artist pursued one, then another, style in order to work 'in his spirit.' But it is mostly omitted that it is a matter of inward events, so many profound scholars come to the conclusion that Faust is the result of individualizing, and at the same time, a typifying, style.

The inner development of personality cannot be grasped in this manner. If personality, individuality and subjectivity are set up as one and the same, then confusion is the inevitable consequence.

The typifying and individualizing styles are not two methods which men from all peoples have used according to their need, but objective and personal styles are essential laws of artistic creation among particular peoples and, in a narrower sense, of individual artists themselves.

Identical words are never like coins of identical value. Depending on context one must agree concerning the predominant meaning of a term, and, if possible, choose more specific words for other shadings. Personality (will plus reason) is a power representing the spiritual in man opposed to the material. In a narrower sense it is the inward and ceaselessly active force of his inward essence, the primordial riddle of the Germanic soul. Persona (instinct plus understanding) is the body of man and his interests. Individuality signifies the indivisible union here on earth of person and personality. 'Individual' treatment refers to this unity, a 'personal' treatment by a personality.

Our object is always the world. The strength of the objectivity of art is dependent on the strength and diversity of these attitudes.

He who found fundamental differences between the objective and subjective directions of creativity saw himself occasioned, through his investigations (which were not pursued further) to contrast with objectivity only subjectivity, i.e., arbitrariness or a mood based upon feelings opposed without style-forming power to the object-value. Therefore many philosophers—in order to protect the great artists from this "interpretation"—also described 'crystal clear objectivity' as their essence—as the sole measuring rod of the highest art. It is now necessary to cast away the dogma of the universal validity of the measuring rod of 'objectivity.'

Goethe once made a remark that it was his opinion that something objective in nature corresponded to every personal will, i.e., that every personal artistic act of will could be transformed into an objective conformity, into an organic law, and that its counterpart could be found there. This completely fixed, personal alignment to the world of matter led to the great inward organic deeds of the 'Romantic' and Gothic eras, although the two stand quite alone in their inner unity. This self-evident feeling, when confronting the cathedrals of Rheims, Ulm and Strasbourg, has long caused us to overlook what violence has been done in these works to the stone material. We have not paid heed to what great formative power of penetration, what strong inner artistic power must have belonged to these artists in order to render such brittle material serviceable to an idea. It must, therefore, be made clear. It had still not occurred to other peoples to create glittering, pointed designs out of stone and build towers with these blocks. The block of stone, the relief, the massive sculpture earlier signified the art of monumental sculptors. In the Gothic era a new spirit appeared. And yet, the Strasbourg cathedral *is*: it stands there, as if having grown out of the ground. It has an objective effect.

A remarkable state of affairs is revealed here. The weightiest artistic personality everywhere carries form with it as gravity, i.e., it carries a living law with it. If, after several violent attempts artists discovered the means of mastering the material, then a work of art is, in the end, an organically effective creation. True personality at first hostilely faces the object to be altered, then the latter is forced to answer to a formal will. When this occurs, personality-style is the result.

The subjectivist is not dominated by a direction of will (not even in an individual work) but by inward and outward contingencies. Subjectivism signifies in every respect, and on every domain, the violent mastery both of the personality and of the object. It is often a charming playfulness or repellent misshapenness—from the aspect of form—and a sensuous teasing, lunatic anarchy or unrestrained lust—as feeling—that is made manifest without an inner or outer law, without inner or outer form. Subjectivism as a philosophic, as well as a purely artistic problem, is the result of an inward barrenness of the racial-crossing of a people, of an individuality, of a whole epoch of time in general, or, as an ultimate end, the reflection of spiritual-racial collapse.

Static and dynamic art nowhere stand so clearly contrasted as in Greek and Gothic architecture. With all Nordic architecture these creations form the sharpest possible contrasting expressions of the formative will. The Gothic signifies the attempt—undertaken in seriousness only once in the entire history of architecture—to shape a spatial art out of a metaphysical feeling of time. The essence of time is conditioned by one direction in contrast to the three dimensions of space. The Gothic knows only a succession of forms, a striving in but one direction. It is therefore involved in a struggle with the material; with the stone block, with horizontal load and vertical support, and with the space-requiring media, the surface of the walls, the roof. Gothic is therefore the fulfillment of a longing which knows only forward motion. It is the first embodiment in stone of the dynamic Western soul, such as painting later attempted to re-embody but which could only completely realize itself in music and, occasionally, in drama. From this universal viewpoint, Gothic is already in its highest degree—personal. It is the eternal, irrational will of the West in the time-conditioned form of one of its rhythmically recurring upward flights.

It is self-evident that the Greek temple was also the expression of a people's sensitivity and therefore, in a certain sense, the expression of a personality. But if, by personality, we usually understand a contrast to what is material—an aggressively active and restless striving to reshape

material into an equation for innermost will and formative artistic powers—then we can trace little evidence of this will in the Greek temple. The Greek temple, admittedly built in honor of a god, also contained a statue of this god. This inner space, sanctified as a holy place, was not the most essential feature but merely the total outward form. The entire building is felt, from the first, to be a piece of plastic art. In fact it is as a self-contained cubic-shaped space. The Greek temple stands in isolation. It reveals no essential relationship to its classical Doric building but is the most perfected self-contained rhythmization of space. In the dimensions of the individual parts the dimensions of the whole are concealed. No line, no embellishment points beyond the temple form itself. All is refined, to be grasped by viewing or even experienced as a function. Load and support are expressed in the clearest manner and stand in perfect equilibrium to one another.

The whole building is three-layered: the roof load with frieze and architrave, the supporting series of pillars and the broad projecting foundation for the steps. Because the entire work is conceived as one piece, the classical Doric pillar, for example, is without a base. If the Greek looked for individual features, then a base would have been utilized—as it was later, during the time of the Ionic and the Renaissance. In Doric times, however, the entire sub-structure formed the basis for the entire row of pillars and the attendant load. The load of the roof is supported at individual points by the pillars. Like bolsters, so to speak, the Doric capital pushed itself in, following in its circumference the mathematical line of force, down to its last guiding-line which represented the most gifted creation of a style created by a will that aimed at objectivity. The character of the support of the pillar is indicated through a slight swelling of the shaft. The horizontal plane of the load is stressed again by the triple division of the architrave, while the overhang of the cornice moulding is realized by the eaves. Above it, the overhang of the cornice moulding is represented by the eaves. The unhindered termination of the Cymatium rises into the air with a gentle sweep. On the gable corners and point the acroterias stand as resting points. For reasons of static and formal representation the corner pillars are strengthened somewhat and bent inward. From experiences of perspective the pillars are not placed strictly horizontal. We find everywhere an artistic will striving for expression of what is objective and, simultaneously, with formal giftedness. The fluctuation of the ratios of the pillar arrangements, the introduction of richer decoration in the gable fields; on the friezes, the lightening of the Ionic—all of this has not essentially altered the Greek

leitmotiv. Through the course of half a millenium, clear, free Greek genius had repeatedly re-shaped the basic principle of architecture. Its perfected form has left behind unmistakeable traces everywhere.

It is not an inward urge—indeed, scarcely anything is personal in our sense—which speaks from the stones. Hardly anything subjective is expressed in it. It is the spirit of artistic objectivity, born only once in the world in such perfection.

The Gothic naturally represents realistic prerequisites, a technically clear law of construction. Attempts have even been made to 'explain' it from purely engineering considerations. But to the Germanic spirit—the Gothic belongs to the German epoch of the Nordic West—in contrast to the spirit in Germany itself which began consciously in the 18th century but only today awakens to clear awareness—the new technical innovations such as the pointed arch, flying buttress and fluted vaulting were really only means for the realization of a new will. They were not a goal in and of themselves. This new will seized, in an authoritarian manner, the available forms. It is understandable if our gracefully posturing artists, philosophers and aesthetes whined about the 'rough violence shown to Greek beauty.'

The individual column, a seemingly compact support, loses its independence as a separate part. Together with others, it is used in a cluster of uprights and, where possible, pushed upward. The capital of this cluster is not to be regarded as a bolster for taking over a load. It signifies only a rhythmical beat in the flow of lines. It is essentially the emphasizing of the attachment of the richly drawn pointed arch. A dynamic function was developed from a purely static base.

All technical advantages of the new method of building are clearly recognized. The possibility of spanning over unequally great spaces with an identical height of the arch, to apply the vaulting pressure by fluted vaults on only a few points, then to have this caught up by flying buttresses and the strong piers—this illustrates how this completely new play of forces creates other constructional foundations and demands solutions and can only be judged from the aspect of spiritual-technical originality which is unconcerned with Greek standards. When Schopenhauer asserted that the essence of architecture consisted in expressing as clearly as possible the mutual ratio between load and support, that this occurs best of all through the horizontal and the vertical, he revealed that he was completely under Greek influence. In the Gothic, the play of pressure and counter-pressure is far more alive and varied than in Greek

temple construction. Viewed in this way, the Greek solution is impoverished and limited, more static than dynamic, a condition of rigidity with less flowing line. The Gothic architect is conscious of harmonious, tangible and unimposed rhythm. Thus, we have, for example, the connecting lines between the crown and the attachment-point of the arch in the middle nave, and the lines which lead from one base to the capital of the adjacent pillar cluster. These always form parallels. The first-mentioned line always strikes with its elongation at the foot of the pillar in the aisle. The same considerations occur in the design of the side facade and of the entire outer building. It is thus beyond doubt that the purely objective aspect of the layout was never neglected, otherwise how could the towers have risen into the air? But nevertheless, this was all only a means to an end. For all material was subordinated to a definite will. This will flew away from earth. It wished to know nothing further about the pressure of horizontal load. It wished primarily to overcome all earthly gravity, to express not a functional construction of the material but the effect of a completely determined movement of soul. It did not seek for models. It authoritatively took available material, tested it and then imprinted its seal upon it; it was personality. Through the oblique transfer of forces we find the first possibility of realizing this idea. From sectioned buttresses, richly-conceived, an arch thrusts upward. The upward rising line is guided by the pointed roof. Finally it takes over at the tower, which, through the most sensitive designs, becomes ever new and ever lighter, fleeing upward into the air. The last impression of a load is called forth by the surfaces of the tower spire. Therefore, here, all work is directed toward shaping it as slimly as possible. Finials are placed on the profile in order to interrupt the line which relates to load. The surface itself is broken through or replaced completely by vertically placed volatizations, as in the Antwerp cathedral. The tenacious will has been applied here, bringing the gravity pull of the earth under its command. It cannot be measured by our era which today moves on without ever understanding the marvelous Gothic creations. Only a few stand with homage before the evidences of the mighty, much-maligned 'Middle Ages' which were truly Germanic in many ways. If a truly great faith is ever again to enter into our hearts, then the 'Gothic soul' will also awaken again in a new form. At present it enthuses only in other spheres.

The dispute concerning the nature of the Gothic has ended. Its foundations were laid in Nordic France. At that time, the ancestors of the Huguenots had not yet been driven out. At that time the guillotine had still not shed any precious Nordic blood. At that time a European rhythm

still prevailed in the kingdom of the Franks. But slowly, the elements of the 'Romantic' Mediterranean and the Alpine-races of the Southeast pushed forward to be mixed with the Germanic, creating those Frenchmen who reached their peak in the 17th and 18th centuries. Some great men still look back today at the vanished past with a longing. These are the men of perishing blood.

But even if Northern France was still almost completely Germanic in the 'Middle Ages,' certain differences between French and German Gothic had already taken shape. Admittedly, Notre Dame at Paris rose upward mightily as did the cathedrals at Rheims and Amiens. All are built according to the same basic type. They are triple-naved with sexagonal choirs and pictureseque choir aisles. They all have two towers. All these buildings contain a triple division in the principal facade porches, rose windows and king's gallery. All have the usual horizontal division lines.

The Gothic idea did not completely achieve a breakthrough. In Germany, we see, from the start, the greatest diversity. The choir soon became hexagonal. Some were built four-sided. The dimensions deviate greatly from one another. Hall churches appear with naves of equal height, like the beautiful Elizabeth church in Marburg. Ulrich von Ensingen built five nave cathedrals and provided them with only one tower as in Ulm. More rapidly than in France, the arch became increasingly pointed. The walls disappeared almost completely. The portal was elevated through lighter gables. The facade's horizontal lines were removed. The middle structure between the towers was narrowed. Finally nothing was left other than a striving upwards and this was repeated everywhere. The profiles speak of it. The added sculptures followed the architectural line. A pointed work deriding the gravity of stone spanned the walls. Like a mighty symphony the lights flooded into the halls. Their unreal flashing allows the last remainder of the world to vanish.

The Gothic, distinct from the Greek temple, attained its high point in interior construction. The great windows with stained glass paintings replaced the constricting walls and counteracted, through their colors and light-effects, the feeling of narrow confinement. Here also, motion was consciously conveyed in the calm space, thus, the feeling of time in a spatial art. The play of sunlight through bright panes is, in its nobility, the opposite of the color effect; the Parthenon, for example, had nothing other than surface tones which stood out spatially one from another. This world-feeling of the Gothic building has been attributed to the forest longings of the Teutons—Chateaubriand even saw in this the 'spirit of Christianity'—although the latter was and still is the bitterest enemy of

the Germanic feeling for nature. The columns represented the tree trunks; the pointed arch, the foliage; the windows and the sky peeping through. Undoubtedly, there is something true in this interpretation except that here cause and effect are confused. The columns, etc., are not new realizations of the forest but allude to the same irrational essence which once sought the dark waving woods and looked through them into endless distances. This essence created the Gothic flying buttress and the mystic play of colors from the same world-feeling.

Thus even the inner space of the Gothic cathedral became change and correlation, not lines and spatial-shaping returning into themselves and, the same holds true for the exterior structure.

The Greek temple was a plastic creation to be viewed from all sides, standing soberly closed off and independent in itself. The Gothic cathedral spiralled upward out of a swarm of little gabled houses, using the latter as measuring rod of its size with the little houses and their inhabitants leaning on the common creation of their soul. Let those who wish laugh at this, but, for me, the essence of two souls speaks here: harmony of the outward individualization and the inward-striving of the dynamic personality. I considered it quite vulgar to lay bare the cathedrals of Cologne, Ulm, etc. in order to 'view them better.' In doing this, we had proceeded from the Greek, not the Nordic, spirit. We had committed a sin against ourselves. After the deed was done the eyes of the desolators were opened. How they want to re-build the little houses.

The personal, type-forming spirit of the 13th and 15th centuries was given voice in poetry, stone and wood, making its appearance on beds cabinets, trunks and staircases. It attempts to be simultaneously intimate and diverse. It is also a hymn to civic individuality. Walther von der Vogelweide sang his unconstrained songs of freedom. Wolfrom von Eschenacb and Meister Gottfried composed German melodies. Other media expressed the German soul: The chisel and the brush were later replaced by the organ and the orchestra.

Hellenic culture reached its peak in a plastic art of which architecture was only a part. Everything was subordinated to this plastic viewpoint. Greek sculpture turned itself almost exclusively toward the person of man. Man as body was the motif for centuries, attaining its highest perfection in literally thousands of works.

The objective will govered here. Everything self-willed is suppressed. Everything irrational is guided back to simple conditions; all folds and creases are smoothed; all excesses eliminated. The Greek league of youth, the Ephebia, created its art here. Thus the works stand in long

succession up to Phidias, Skopas and Praxiteles, and, even in its most subjective imitators—as at Pompeii—Greek art remained formally intact. This certainity of form is both the strength and weakness of the Greeks. It was strong as long as the Hellenes remained preserved from many false paths. It was weak, when it lost the inner strength of the will. Every movement is changed into repose, even a wrestling match became a balanced adjustment of equilbrium. This is almost a complete rejection of personality. One often has the feeling that this form and superior self-control springs from a certain feeling of fear. The much-praised serenity of Greek art did not exhaust its essence. A subterranean feature of melancholy passed through the Greek soul but it was—in this case happily—not strong enough to influence artistic creation. The Greek sense of proportion was occasionally broken, as in the 'Dionysian' Bacchanalia wherein complete attention was diverted to the bathhouse, feasts, etc.

Where the phallis was openly displayed as a symbol in the "Late Greek" style we have evidence of self-disintegration. The Greeks displayed the will to such an extent in the combating of instinct, that, in the creation of art, the superior reason took over the leading role. Hence the objectivity of the Hellenic is established. This, also, is the origin of our dogmas of aesthetic "mood" devoid of will.

A religious basis was common to the highest Greek and Gothic art. In the religious disposition, even when it is not openly expressed, is revealed the feeling toward something eternal; the characteristics of this frame of mind are, for us, a sign that the primal spiritual power of man which is alone creative, is really alive. From this frame of mind comes the saint, the great student of nature, the philosopher, the preacher of moral value, the great artist. If a man or a people lacks this mood which is formless but which is alone capable of giving birth, then it also lacks the prerequisite to produce a great and truthful art. Its erroneous subjectivity will then necessarily gain the upper hand. Phidias and Kallikrates created in honor of the gods; and, in honor of God, the folk souls of entire centuries worked on the cathedral at Cologne, on the rock temples of India and on statues of the eternally calm Buddha. The primal element becomes form through artistic rebirth. Even if this divine element bears no name, its breath still lives in a self-portrait by Rembrandt or in a poem by Goethe. This truly religious primal ground is lacking, except for small residues, in the race of the Semites and their bastard half-brothers, the Jews. The world-withdrawn disposition of heart matured to religious belief will—even if it must necessarily retain earthly ideas—always

strive to strip away the last remnants of earth or envelop itself completely in silence. This cannot be otherwise with the belief in immortality which is spiritual in feeling.

* * *

In the entire Old Testament we find no trace of belief in immortality unless it be the reflection of the proven outward effect of the Persians on the Jews during the "banishment." The Jewish aim is the creation of a 'paradise' on earth. For this purpose, as is stated in the later 'Holy Books,' the righteous (i.e., the Jews) will creep into the promised land from their graves all over the world, emerging through holes bored in the earth by unknown forces solely for them. *The Targum*, the *Midraschim* and the *Talmud*, describe with delight this 'magnificent' state of affairs in the expected paradise. The chosen people will then rule over the entire world. All other peoples will become its slaves. They will die and be born again in order to go anew to hell. The Jews, however, will not go there, but will lead a blessed life on earth. Jerusalem will be rebuilt in the most splendid way. The Sabbath boundaries will be set with jewels and pearls. If anyone should have debts to pay, then he will need only tear a pearl from the hedge and he will become free of all obligations. Fruit will ripen every month, grapes will grow as large as an entire room, grain will grow of its own accord, the wind will blow the corn together and the Jews will only need to shovel up the meal. Eight hundred varieties of roses will grow in the gardens and streams of milk, balsam, honey and wine will flow through Palestine. Every Jew will possess a tent over which a golden vine will grow on which thirty pearls will hang. Under every vine will stand a table with jewels. In this paradise 800 kinds of flowers will bloom. In the midst the Tree of Life will grow, radiating 500,000 kinds of taste and scent. Seven clouds will lie over the tree and the Jews will knock its branches so that its magnificent perfume is wafted from one end of the world to the other.

This land of milk and honey grew with religious sanction and then celebrated its rebirth in Jewish Marxism with its "splendid" future state. The greed of the Jews exists because of their bankrupt theology, whether of the past or present. At the same time, they almost completely lack a truly spiritual and artistic creativity. The primary religious element is lacking. The outward belief in immortality has been given only a superficial adjustment to an essentially alien outlook. It has never been an inwardly determined driving-force.

For this reason, Jewish 'art' will never be personal and will never attain a really objective style, revealing only technical skill and subjective ostentation, destined for outward effect and mostly linked with coarse obtrusiveness if not utterly based on immortality. In Jewish 'art' we have almost the sole example of how an ancient group—one cannot really call them a people—which has lived in many great cultures has been unable to overcome animal instinct. Jewish 'art' is almost unique in that it is related only to instinct. It awakens neither aesthetic self-forgetfulness nor the human will. It merely—at its best—gives vent to technical judgement or it arouses only subjective feeling.

Let us look at the Jewish artists. We can begin with the Psalms, which alternately chatter with fear, exult terror, or revengefully foam at the mouth. Thanks to Luther's poetry this often sounds beautiful. We then find the groaning Gebirol, the lustful David ben Solomon and the contemporary degenerate Heinrich Heine. Look at Kellermann who worships Mammon or Schnitzler the sensual seeker. Felix Mendelssohn was led toward Back by Zelter after many barren years, although the Jews now extol his alleged virtues. At best his creations are technical-formally correct. Look at Mahler who flew toward the heights but who finally had to 'Jewify' expecting to create the ultimate from a thousand voiced choir. Let us look at the massive over-exaggeration of the circus-like theater of Reinhard-Goldman. Let us examine the Jewish 'wonder children' at the piano or violin, and what do we find? Technique, sham, affectation, quantity, virtuosity—in short, everything one could ask for except true genius and creative power. With its hereditary alienation from European nature the whole of Jewry made itself into the promoter of black 'art' in all domains.

It was already proved by Duhring that the commandment to set up no gods for the nation can be traced back to the complete Jewish incapacity for formative art. This is likewise the reason why it could be an effective prohibition over thousands of years. The contemporary despairing attempts by Jewish artists to prove their talents through futurism, expressionism, and 'new objectivity' are a living witness to this old fact. Individual attempts to create a higher culture should not be denied, but Jewry, as a whole, lacks a soul from which really great values are born.

When, as in our times, Jewish 'artists' take a significant place in artistic life, this is an unmistakeable sign that we have fallen away from the right path: that within us—it is to be hoped only temporarily—an essential spiritual power has been buried under cultural rubbish.

The art of Islam is also almost purely subjective. All the murmuring of the splashing picturesquely constructed wellsprings: all the leafy shade; all the brightness of shimmering color; all the candle lighting of the Alhambra and all the confusing line-play of the wall decorations of the palaces—all these things cannot conceal the inner spiritual poverty of the race.

Such greatness as Islam has left to us on its passage through the world—the massive cupolas of the Caliphs' graves, the meditations on Greek wisdom, the fairy tales full of fantasy—are today recognized by us as borrowings from alien spirits. Some have their origins in Greece, some in Iran and others in India. A system which had no metaphysical religion could not be really creative. Even if the Arabic 'Beyond' was not based on the idea of an earthly paradise—on establishing a firm place in the world, as with the Jews—the substance of the ideas would be essentially the same. That this barrenness of soul is paired with an inflexible faith alters nothing. We can only recognize the Arabic culture as partially individualistic, but not as original or creative.

We have shown, and will continue to show, that the longings of most other peoples are interrelated. Viewed in this way, Lao Tse approximates the ideas of Jajnavalkya, Christ and the great men of Europe, different as they all are from one another. Forces are at work which, although living spatially close, were inwardly nevertheless worlds apart from one another.

Remote from Islam lies conformity to the objective as well as to the personal. Just as it has created neither a great epic nor a great music, so has it also created no racial form of architecture. It has borrowed all architectural ideas from the Aryan Persians. It has exhibited no really legitimate, new forms as true expressions of the soul. From what we have learned from history and archaeology, the Arab has merely imitated other, higher cultures.

However, the Arab subjectivity did create the horseshoe arch. The horizontal beam carrying the casing for the placing of the ordinary arch rested on the projections of the pillar or of the pier. After its removal, there resulted a very perceptible projection which was then simply filled in with mortar. As a result, the arch received a form unconditioned by any kind of static necessity. However, this was not the expression of an inwardly formative will. It was inartistic arbitrariness. This new form was repeated in the arch-line, then, the cloverleaf arch was invented, followed by the arch with a projecting stone tongue, etc. The different varieties can be studied. In the mosque at Cordova, at Elashar in the minaret at

Kait-Bai, at the Barkuk mosque at Cairo, at the Meshkehmeh mosque at Bulak and in the cloister church in Segovia. Additionally, in many buildings, one arch attachment strikes on the apex of the other, creating the most impossible variations of arches, beehive buildings, etc. The diverse, richly entwined, often strictly 'Islamic' ornamentations, wall designs and lattice work came almost entirely from Persia. Old Iranian fabric designs and illuminated manuscripts provided the models.

The baseless Doric column was adapted from the Iranian-Aryan building techniques and art. This principle is then prostituted in the hall of the famed Alhambra. Completely apart from the fact that the pillars have mostly been taken from other buildings and have had to be balanced by abutments of varied strength and height, the arches tower, doubled above each other. The pillars scarcely seem able to bear the pressure and virtually push holes in the arches.

The essence of Islamic architecture is revealed in the oft-praised arabesque. It is the most beautiful style that the Arabs created. It is not true architecture, however, but mere decorative art. An arbitrary spirit is revealed here. The ornamentation covers the entire wall. It is directionless and can be elongated on all sides or closed off at will. If Greek decor was terminated in a fixed space, composed with a determined surface limitation—if, in Gothic work, everything subordinated itself to the earth-escaping vertical direction and, as a result, was made subject in every case to an external law as a consequence of an inward striving for a goal—then, in the arabesque, expressionless immoderation prevails. The best instinct for what is valuable in 'Islamic architecture' has been shown by scenery painters of the operetta or specialty theatre. This was suitable domain for decorative trifling and directionless over-indulgence.

It is necessary to single out this alien essence. Today we can do this with justice, for, by exact study of purely technical building methods, we receive a means which we can use also to pass judgement on other expressions of Islamic style. Our "philosophers" should cease seeing a "Magian soul" in the arabesque, cease rediscovering in it something akin to the Faustian nature striving toward the infinite. Much which Islam has left behind is certainly better than as described, but then, it is also revealed, as proven in documents, that the real creators of this architectural legacy were not Arabs. The "Arabic" science—the cultivation of Greek philosophy—did not evolve in the hands of the Arabs. Rather, it was carried on almost exclusively by Arabic-speaking Persians. For example, the mosque of the Prophet at Medina was erected by foreign artisans. El Walid had to send to Byzantium for artists and engineers to

build in Jerusalem. The Greeks erected the "wonder of the world" at Damascus.

In Egypt, the Arabs discovered a rich Coptic architecture. The beautiful construction of many buildings there originated with Coptic engineers. A Coptic artist built the Ibn-Tulun mosque. It was he who used the pointed arch consciously for the first time. The model for this arch was provided by the marble gate in the Nahassin quarter which had earlier stood on the Norman church of St. Jean d'Acre. One must take note of all this in order to gain a correct insight into the different influences. Sassanids, Coptics and Greeks provided the foundation. Then Arabic whimsicality took over with a decorative over-indulgence.

It may now be understood why the copying of these Arabic elements—the cloverleaf arch, keel arch, arabesque, etc.—will never, at any time, find acceptance with us. They are alien to us and should always remain separated from us. They are evidence of an alien soul to which none of the concepts of art, personality or objectivity-style are to be applied.

* * *

Between directionless artistic subjectivism and the inwardly organic style of personality authoritatively mastering the material, there is a graded succession of artist and orientations of art. Many artists are gifted with tendencies for what is higher, without, however, being able to guide this gift into an artistically well-rounded perfection. Others search untroubled into normal life, to describe, paint and stylize out of pure formative joy. The union of person and personality given here on earth directs and possesses us.

We must establish an intermediary stage between subjectivism and personality art, i.e., the transition from arbitrariness to inner law. Let us name these domains, the *individual style* in which something organic is emphasized but where a limitation is also revealed. Such designations—this must be expressly underlined—are methodologically necessary in order to grasp a life which is ever in flux. We can only perceive something when we see it as form, even when the outlines are not rigid but may be plasticly removed.

The love of what is individual is an outstanding feature of Europe. To discover this, we only need to cast a fleeting glance at Nordic poetry, architecture, sculpture and paintings. Gothic stonemasons and woodcarvers, the landscape painters of all districts, the artists of the monastic Bibles, the inventors of the Gothic script, the narrators of strange

stories—all of these show a striving for expression. For every energetic expression there is a form given by a thousand hands. The same spirit lives in the hundreds of painters of Holland. It is alive in all the artists of old France, and, even today, it finds a new imprint on isolated individualities.

Peter Paul Rubens belongs to this domain, as one of its first great men. No one doubts that great treasures of powerful electrifying fantasy have seen the light of the world through him. How he dealt with it, what material, what spiritual content is applied, how the direction of its treatment was determined—these things show us an artist standing almost exactly in the middle, between subject and personality. His whole work is directed at sensuous nature with its thousand colors and forms, with its joys and fears. We find the stepladder of our mortal individuality expressed in the delicacy of his portrait of Isabella Brandt. We see it also in the lustful possession of the great Kirmes—from the sensual lust for life of his nymphs to the drunken Silenus to the sorrowful cry of the damned as they fall down into Hell. The themes are always new and alive with an artistic objectivity conscious of its goal. But nowhere does Rubens succeed in a creation which can illuminate either this entire earthly joy or earthly sorrow as an allegory. Nowhere does he give evidence of the success of a great, true, inner, supernatural vision, although Rubens often attempted it. His great canvas of Christ ascending to Heaven, the saviour, who, standing on the globe of the world, treads upon the head of the serpent; the Apocalyptic dragons and other monsters; the massed clouds; the rejoicing angels and the fluttering, shimmering garments—all of these signified an unequalled application of material and fantasy, but they are only unsuccessful attempts. The greater the scope of his works became, the less we see their spiritual thrusting power. Rubens' *Descents into Hell*—master works of life, mobility and composition—nevertheless show only outward exuberance but are persuasive in making credible a secret supernatural power by an outward application of strength.

Rembrandt soared above this world with works in which a smiling conquest of the world and a shattering despair have guided his brush. Rubens' last work was himself in shining armor a St. George slaying the dragon. Rubens lived a rich existence as a man. He was honored as a great artist by an entire world. He displayed the untroubled refinement of individuality. Rembrandt withdrew completely into himself and surveyed the world—unsentimentally but filled with deepest premonitions—as a material which is to be overcome. Rubens' work is a powerful

symphony of life in all its forms. The power of worldly existence is its content. In his greatest works all the symbols—found in the treasury of Greek legend and in the apocalyptic parables—are pushed aside and, with which the insane life of his environment formed the foundation for the *Kirmes* in the Louvre. Whoever has stood before this work sees in a moment what took Schopenhauer his entire life to describe: the power of blind instinct. Without allegory, life itself has been represented here. The gluttons and drunkards, the whores and lechers, the singers and drunken women dancers all repeat one and the same song, that of the unbridled beast. The artistic power which flung this, so to speak, with a jolt onto the canvas, is unique in its manner. The individual, without any restraints, had become the content and art form of Rubens.

Similarly, but less powerfully, Frans Hals reveals himself, laughingly, and mockingly as he brought life onto the canvas with a broad brush. Inspired by the same spirit, but filled with unequal dramatic impetus, is Adrian Brouwer, an artist who died too early. His descriptions of the instinctive-individual often remind one of Rubens' *Kirmes*. He allows us to discern an artist, who, had he lived a longer life, would perhaps have mastered his material. He might have formed an inwardly dramatic life from Holland's genre painting.

Another artist whose works we could describe unhesitatingly as being of an individual style is Lorenzo Bernini. This last great sculptor—the architect of the colonnades of St. Peter's Square—was honored by an entire generation as one of its greatest artistic geniuses. We would also admire him except for his rather mediocre design of the entrance to the Sistine and except for his perceptible sensual note (for example, with *Amor and Psyche*) and except for his exaggerated use of 'charming' materials. These are signs of adaptation to the taste of the broad masses or signify, at least, a prostitution of his innermost creative power.

Like Rubens—a man of the greatest fantasy and mastery of his material, a master in utilization of all methods and artifices of painting and materials—Bernini lacked that greatness of soul and mysterious magic which emanates from the works of a DaVinci or Rembrandt or from the creations of Master Erwin.

Now we must write a few words about the "Baroque" period and its meaning. Our histories of art which speak about the "Masters of the Baroque era" as representatives of a singular direction of art and spirit. However, these interpretations are in error and are useless unless we are able to define the essence of the term, Baroque. In contrast to the spirit of the Renaissance which sought only harmony, the Baroque era was a search for expression. Apart from the fact that they did not search only for

expression, the great men of the Renaissance—DaVinci, Donatello, Masaccio—one cannot make this statement about their art. For whatever is it supposed to mean, when it said that Michelangelo is Baroque? Are Valasquez, Shakespeare, Rembrandt, Rubens and Hals? Are their works Baroque in spirit? Great differences appear which cannot be expressed with one word. If a fundamental unity has not previously been attained by means of a clear differentiation there is, at least, a plurality contained in a notion.

We see the Gothic from an unequally greater distance than we see the period of the "Baroque." We grasp its uniform striving for a goal clearly. In spite of this, very different accompanying elements and assertions are to be recorded with its evaluation. In fact, the "Baroque" is a new wave of spirit which is to be valued not only in its temporal length, the extent of flight and power, but particularly in its value-laiden depth. Here, the measuring rod drawn from the essence of our art will prove itself particularly fruitful. We have already seen the results in Gothic art, with its effective strength of artistic personality, of individuality, of subjectivism.

One rightly sees in Michelangelo the artist who most visibly breaks with all the aesthetic precepts of Greece. His art exhibits no appeasement of passion in his balanced form. Rather, one sees the unleashing of passion through personality, through a personal will in art. His works stand before us as a wild and conscious protest against Hellas. This man who spoke neither Greek nor Latin, created the Slaves, Moses, the Medici tombs and the Sybyls and Prophets. They reveal such richness of soul and such knowledge, that Goethe could say that, after Michelangelo, nature no longer pleased him since he could not gaze upon it with such great eyes as the genius. Michelangelo created for himself a law which he alone followed. He alone was able to master his material. Rembrandt went to work in exactly the same, personal way and Shakespeare was equally great.

In the life work of these men we find the stepladder from crass individuality to perfected "inspiration." Rembrandt's *Monk in a Cornfield*, his heads of Jews, his drawings of neglected corners and of men, are works which master life in all its heights and depths, ranging from the *Couple in Bed* to the *Hundred Gulden Note*. His imitators and lesser contemporaries remained rooted in the individual sphere. The power of concentration he showed in the outline and construction of Michelangelo's St. Peter was a mere outward application of energy. His vestibule in the Vatican library, ignoring all architectural limitations, with its broken-work pilasters and wild guiding of lines, was a unique subjective outbreak but one which, with many others, became a permanent principle. Groups of

heaped-up columns and flighty cornices appear; decorative cornices are knocked in the walls; gables are perforated and filled with scrolls; towers and facades are profiled with rounded forms and mighty volutes strive to the center of the building. *Il Gesu, Maria della Salute* and a hundred other buildings bear witness not only to great assertions of strength but also to a styled will which is determined only in the individual manner of a painter. Later, these forms were plunged deeper into the sphere of subjectivism.

The Jesuit counter-Reformation used tin radiance, paper tinsel, plaster garlands covered over with gilt and other follies to blind the masses. Art became a means to reconquer hearts lost through the Reformation. Individual Popes had given aid to great art for their own splendor and for the splendor of Rome. They had little real delight in these creations. Jesuit-inspired artists worked sensuous, powerful, willed painting. They perfected artistic lack of restraint and this became known as the Jesuit style of art.

The "sitting column," the paste and stucco coullisses of such as Pozzo, S.J., are classic models for those who would study artistic crimes. Unfortunately, these abortions are still found all over Europe. The lofty flight of the Gothic had ended. Raceless Rome had triumphed over the Nordic spirit in architecture. Protestantism, on the other hand, falling into the other extreme, allowed an impoverishment to enter its houses of God which made the heart grow cold. The heart had been heretofore sensuously overheated in the Jesuit churches by gold, tin and incense.

The era of the Baroque is to be equated in its greatest representatives with the innermost will of the creators of the cathedrals of Ulm, Strasburg, Rheims, Leon, Compiegne and Cologne, except that this spirit made use of other means. If, in the 13th and 14th centuries, architecture was the medium dominating everything and embodying the deepest longing; in the 16th and 17th, it was sculpture and painting that dominated. It was supported by musical spirit. The chisel and brush appeared in place of the compass and carpenter's square. If, in the 13th century, one could justly speak of a uniformly directed personal Western soul, so now one could talk of individual personalities who indeed were outstanding more in a portrait than in the building of a cathedral over many years and by many hands.

In the same way that the Gothic at last betrayed itself by creating playful vaulting artifices and fishbubble designs, also did the Baroque commit suicide with its incompetent imitations of Michelangelo. The feeling of life carried Masters Erwin and Rembrandt to the supreme

heights, while below, the wills of thousands were not strong enough to follow.

What is essential is the recognition that autocratic mastery of materials forms the basis of the Gothic as it did the Baroque. But while the one era carried out its heaven-storming plans, the other remained a quiet spiritual concentration. A further step occurred when poetry and music in a new Gothic-Baroque wave of art aided the Nordic and German nature to achieve its deepest expressions.

What we have called German or Nordic-Western art is here revealed in its inner structure. Its goal is the embodiment of supreme spiritual action expressed through new means and in a continuous new form. From subjective attitudes and individual creations (i.e., unities) a new spiritualizing of the world developed which, after it had unfolded its splendor, sank back into shapelessness ready for recasting.

We have experienced this three times; at the time of the Gothic, in Baroque art and at the time of Goethe, whose posthumous influence is still felt. This is the life-pulse of Europe, a pulse which beats more rapidly and dramatically than that of other peoples. We hold in suspicion the present widespread lamentation which announces the cultural decline of the West. These harbingers of disaster pay no attention to the increasing pulsebeat of our Nordic culture. They believe we have breathed our last. If other peoples do not seem to possess this rhythm, but have left behind a single life-line, then this still says nothing about our law of life. Men who, with predeliction, use the example of a flowering and withering plant, should pursue this analogy somewhat further before it can be of use to us. A searing autumn wind blows through our present cultural world. Whoever feels himself an old man will find many reasons to imagine the coming winter as his last. Whoever has lost faith recognizes impassionate understanding as simultaneously ruler and shaper. But whoever has recognized not China's many thousand year old intake of breath, but the powerful pulsebeat of Europe as a uniqueness belonging only to him, looks with a much more different vision into the past and future than the preachers of our "predestined" decline! The Gothic period ended in the desolation of the guild system and with the mastersingers languishing in dullest sobriety. The Baroque period turned itself inside out in a thousand insanities.

Today, after an enormously aimless use of old forms, we are presently witnessing an equally directionless anarchy exhaust itself furiously. We have still not reached the ebb. But, as happened three times in the past, Europe also draws a new breath for a fourth time. No one yet knows what

means for the renewed turning-inward of our life will be the right ones. But in all events, they will be used to link us to what is eternal, so that we are able to experience the birth of a truly new form.

The second half of the 19th century was, as far as architecture and the arts were concerned, a period of a hitherto unknown shapeless adaptation of all previous forms. Authorities of all periods, designs from all centuries and paintings from the works of all peoples decorated the work place of the architect. Imitation dominated all the art and architecture of the period.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, technical development moved forward with an unsuspected speed, requiring more and more newer factories, railway stations, power stations, etc., so that no time remained for an artistic development to match the new era's requirements. It was no longer possible to control the new problems dispassionately so things moved devoid of direction along the well worn paths of old. We began building those frightful looking railway stations, factories and warehouses with cast Greek colonades and acanthus leaves complete with imitations of Moorish, Gothic and Chinese forms. Many were capped by the crudest iron constructions. Even today, the whole of Europe is covered with the products of an unprecedented decline in art. When a new generation wished to become violently "personal" the ill-reputed "youthful style" appeared. Its crimes against art have been observed with astonishment from Paris to Moscow and Budapest. This controversy still rages unhindered in many places today. The creative power was broken because it had become distorted ideologically and artistically by alien standards. It was no longer equal to the new demands of life.

The renewed enthusiasm for the Gothic, experienced around the turn of the 20th century, produced as its consequence those new "Gothic" churches and city halls. This revealed the impossibility of using Gothic forms in contemporary creations. Our present world feeling is no longer a vertical striving away from the world. It is a desire for strength and expression but not in the form of the old Gothic will.

The personal Gothic style, even if it arose from the primal Germanic character, reflected a definite kind of feeling prevailing only then. Our era must use its own building blocks in the erection of monumental structures. Water towers need powerful enclosed forms. Simple gigantic masses are required for grain silos. Our factories must be given a weighty shape. Scattered business buildings are to be concentrated into single giant houses of labor. Electric generating works, with their various apparatus, are to be spread over the earth. The buildings of a large factory

which were thrown together haphazardly in the past, will be moved together organically to an inner community. The "Moorish" railway stations are to be pulled down. A resounding song of iron and stone is heard in new rhythms. And while disillusion followed behind disillusion, real creative joy passed through the world. A generation of architects, conscious of honor, began to understand the new questions of life and to struggle for expression stated according to time and essence. The lack of restraint still possibile in the other arts found, in architecture, its regulating law through utility and economic consideration as end and purposes.

Technical expediency seems to be the prerequisite of all architecture. The Gothic form is forever surpassed. But the Gothic soul struggles, as those who are not blind can see, for a new realization. We have made steps toward using new, heretofore untried, solutions to modern architectural problems, especially of the multi-story buildings, the skyscrapers. The frightening aspects of American art, with its skyscrapers with Renaissance style, Gothic gables and Baroque designs, and with absolutely soulless engineering techniques—which even in America are approaching their end—have caused us to overlook the fundamental questions which our life demands. One stone colossus after another replaced the old houses of America. The churches, which heretofore had been the highest buildings, lie in the greatest neglect in the midst of a giant pile of stones. New York was built without an inner standard of value or organic measuring rod. The Gothic architect knew very well that he could not place a church and town hall alongside one another. The size of the one building would have eliminated the size of the other, robbed the height of its necessary measuring rod. American haste and necessity were free of these reflections. But the experiences gained have resulted in demands of an unavoidable kind for Europe.

Along with the problem of a building with a broader foundation we are striving to move onward and upward from the new vertical styling. We are at work on a powerful block which, with its own side-wings, forms a building system in itself. It will develop its own standards. For this reason we will require an elementary law which will say that no new building can be erected in an environment dominated by multi-story buildings. The same will hold true for buildings which rise upward from a small area. Only in this way can spatial rhythm and inner strength be realized.

Thus we hold that to use Gothic external forms is an impossibility. The Gothic inner-will and its laws of construction can only be newly experienced if a true architecture of the future is to appear.

Greek architectural forms are, as elaborated, of objective-functional nature. A Greek kymation is the alpha of all unconfined cornice ending. If a horizontal load is to be taken up by a stone pillar, then the Doric capital, the Doric pillar shaft with its fluting, with its gentle swelling, reproduces the course of the line of strength with almost mechanical faithfulness. The form of the abacus will also be amenable to only a few alterations. These forms of Greek style are eternally subjective and have rightly raised claims for use. If one wishes to give expression to these gently-felt transitions between load and support, the Renaissance believed it could do this. Classicism of the 19th century thought that it was the first to do it properly. In the course of the last decades, an inward retreat and reversal has also taken place. The search of the modern "Gothicist" does not soar upward through the clouds. Rather, it is directed at massive labor. Like Faust, he drains swamps and, after he has apparently been immersed without salvation in the swamp of Classicism and Anarchy, he sees more clearly what he wishes: Ennoblement, intellectuality, inspiration of the roughest labor.

There is still one final thing which gives us the justification to claim the basic forms of ancient Greek archtecture to be applicable. Something goes back to prehistoric times and links objectivity with natural-growth and what is racial as well as personal. The fact is that wherever the culture of the Mediterranean races prevailed, we can establish the round style of building as their basic architectural type. This is the basic type of the Etruscan house and of the pre-Nordic fortresses on Sardinia, and of the primal fortress of Tiryns. But in the north, the rectangular building arose. Even from the times of the Megalith culture onward, buildings exist which have rectangular outlines along with porch and posts. This is the primary type of the later Attic house and the Greek temple. The houses at Haldorf, Neuruppin, in Brandenburg and the houses of the stone age, are the primary images which were carried by the Nordic tribes into the Danube valley, to Moravia, to Italy, to Greece and above all, to the fortresses in Baalbek. From the 8th century B.C. onward Germanic-Grecian houses appeared on the rubble of the old round fortresses of pre-Indo-Germanic Tiryns. The Nordic rectangular buildings arose according to this basic principle. The kings' houses at Mycenae were built following this design as were those in Troy. The Nordic men appeared everywhere as conquerors and creators. "Blond Meneleus" reported by Homer, belonged to the fortress of Alkinoos, which Odysseus in the *Odyssey* saw "built with posts." The great Achaean kings, Atreus and his fellows, who stretched out their hands toward the coasts of Asia Minor, were the

builders of the Trojan palaces. The basic ideas of Greek architecture were of essence with Germanic feeling. The "Romantic"—in reality, Germanic throughout—and the Gothic cathedral have remained—independent of the time-linked form—true to these ideas. The principles which form the basis of both forms signify the essence of the Nordic interpretation of space. In Italy—where the Nordic current, even as it passed over the entire land as in Greece, moved around Etruscan centers so that these frequently remained untouched—we experience the counter-struggle against the rectangular shaping. It passed from the round Etruscan house over the horseshoe construction up to the outlines of the Roman villas of Pompeii. The true origin of the round houses is the racial myth of the Mediterranean peoples. It has little to do with architecture per se.

The aboriginal matriarchy of the pre-Nordic Mediterranean peoples was symbolized by the swamp or the swamp plants and swamp animals; i.e., the symbols of the widespread indiscriminate sexual intercourse. Isis and Mother Nature were represented as sitting amidst the reeds of the swamp. Artemis and Aphrodite were worshipped in "reeds and swamp." The original Etruscan house arose from this same symbolic reed. The stalks of reeds were stuck in a circle in the ground and the canes were fastened together above. This form was then imitated in stone. The first cult of the mother, the swamp cult, was thus the same symbolism as the dwelling hut of the mother-worshipping "Italian" prehistoric people. The struggle is particularly revealed later in the disputes between the central and basilical principle of church building. The great cupola architecture of the original St. Peters—which was later altered to basilical—shows this idea of the ancient round house. Admittedly, the Nordic formative power later mastered this principle, however, it has always remained basically alien to us. The round construction limits vision on all sides. It is directionless, and is basically free on all sides. In the deepest sense of the three-dimensional spatial concept, a round building cannot convey a real spatial feeling at all, not even if it is shaped by a very great artistic hand.

In contrast to the Mediterranean peoples with their animal-mixed images of God, the Nordic Greeks—in whom we can often better view our essence than in the Germanic antiquities almost completely destroyed by the monks—carried a free, undemonic image of the gods in their hearts. As Karl Schuchhardt remarked, the god was established where the first ray of the sun illuminated a peak. Wherever there were free peaks to the east, the Nordic man placed his god. Nordic gods lived on Mount Athos, Olympus, the Parnassus, the Helikon and, in the North on the Wodansberg and Donarberg. Where there were no mountains the tree tops took

their place. The Zeus oak, the sacred oaks of the Teutons were cut down by Bonifacius. In place of these murdered oaks we now find the "Romantic" bells and the Gothic church towers. These caught the first rays of the divine sun in their dizzy heights. The watchman on his tower became their servant and interpreter. When the finials on the towers glowed red, this glitter awoke those same feelings of sublimity as in the past when the peoples of Homer looked up at Olympus or when Old Germanics gathered in the tall oak glades at sunrise.

Thus have the Gothic and Hellenic styles been close in our spiritual and artistic experience. But we do not think of allowing the resultant new possibilities to lie unused or to link them forever to time-bound forms and techniques. On the contrary, we affirm the flow of life, the diversity of spiritual conditions and times. Over and beyond this, we feel the blessing of the mysterious powers of life binding us and, in this case, especially one in particular; the feeling of space which binds us to the same, eternal forms of representation.

The change from a culture that worships material things to a true feeling of spirit has recently been completed. The unbroken Western personality will not attempt to soar away from the earth in eternal longing. It will respect the earth, shape and inspiration in it. It will see in what is finite a parable for infinity; it will permeate the soul with strength. Architecture is now the first art; it is on the way once again to becoming honorable. The great task of surpassing technique by new technique and new creations awaits us. Whoever has eyes to see observes a search to developing consciously an inwardly truthful shape as the new formative will of our life. We see it in the grain silos of California, on a steamship of the North German Lloyd and on the bridges of the Tauerngahn. The time will come when from this new search for truth will arise this search in our homes, theaters, town halls—everywhere. Then, pityingly and with shame, a modern architecture may look down the Berlin Friedrichstrasse, on the Munich Rathaus, on the frightful new cathedrals in Barcelona and on a thousand other testaments inwardly untruthful art and an ideological chaos.

* * *

IV. The Aesthetic Will

Personality and Objectivity have been differentiated. I confess that it is misleading to speak today about "Personality" when every immature individual applies this notion unconcernedly to himself and every leading authority demands it of the future, of the peoples and of the state. It is simultaneously a type and the sire of a type. Despite this, it is clear that the coming form of our existence in the world will flow out on all domains. As is always the case it can be created only by a few great individual men. The fear of being excoriated by those without taste or style has occasioned many a serious man to reject his true self, his personality and his ideals. Nevertheless, he must become his true self.

In the individual consciousness (the ego) individualism and universalism are contained. The individualistic epoch which passes today in dangerous convulsions has again strengthened the universalistic doctrine. These unnatural ideas necessarily produce life-repellant forms against which individualism revolts and which, if necessary, it violently suppresses. Unrestricted individualism and boundless universalism mutually condition each other. Only through the concept of the people as Folk and race, as expression—or, if one wishes, as parallel phenomenon—of a definite soul does the one as well as the other principle receive a limitation of an organic-physical nature. A clear soul and a consciousness of an

always active, spiritual, willed essence signifies true personality. This is and remains the deepest experience of the West and no false shame must hinder the treatment of this question—without which ultimately nothing can be traced back to its foundation.

Just as today efforts are being made to build up State and economy after the collapse of economic-individualism from individualistic ideas—against which the National Socialist idea appears born as the organic and fruit bearing vision of the future—so Western soul and art signifies an eternal effort to give expression to the feeling of loneliness and infinity. The sense of infinity is found in the Gothic, in the self-sublimating music, in the endless garden perspective of Lenotre, in the half-dark of Rembrandt and in infinitesimal calculation.

The feeling of loneliness and infinity is undoubtedly a characteristic of Western nature. In the theater one can discern a reference to this in the Third Act of *Tristan*—if one closes his eyes and places himself in the situation of the lonely man. High on a rocky cliff, above him blue infinity, before him an eternity of space, his body wounded, his insides full of painful torture, near to timelessness, Tristan's soul longs for something infinitely far off, an idea which on earth is personalized in Isolde. In the midst of this desolation, the tones of a shepard's flute can be heard from somewhere in a self-willed world-remote rhythm, exactly expressing what cannot be described in any words born of reason. Wagner worked on *Tristan* in Venice, alone, deliberately secluded, separated from Mathilde with suicidal thoughts in his heart.

Consider another picture. Han Sachs lived in the midst of the greatest philistinism. At the beginning of act three of *Die Meistersinger* he passes into loneliness. Yet he is not alone there. Around him are thousands of people in living carnival mood, in a picturesque city, happy pairs as lovers and, among them, his own protege. All of these cry out joyously to "our great Sachs." Cries of applause resound. In the midst of this activity he stands there smiling, rich, but nevertheless lonely, in isolation, and utters words concerning what is eternal in art. His ideas are incomprehensible to many. They are only words about the "German Masters." Again, there is this feeling of infinity but expressed in a way that is completely different from *Tristan*. In *Tristan* Wagner created harmony of the outward and inward; with Hans Sachs there is contrast.

What is it that calls forth this feeling of infinity, abandonment and loneliness? What is that feeling which we encounter so strongly imprinted on no other race and culture soul known to us? There have been sufficient references to the manifold differences in the souls of peoples and to the

eternal restlessness of Faustian natures and to their feeling of infinity but we still have not been brought to real consciousness. The Indian had a feeling of eternity and this is ancient Aryan property. But the later Indian floated in the all soul. He longed only for total dissolution. His infinity consisted in the recognition of the equality of all phenomena as related to the all soul. He could not have felt loneliness in our sense. He saw himself everywhere and nowhere.

The Faustian man penetrates into the infinite, profoundest depths, but he is essentially solitary . . . But that is only possible because he experiences inwardly an immortality unique only to himself. He elevates himself from an environment as a person, because he *is* personality. He senses his immortal unique soul. That soul is an eternally active master which searches for strength, time and spacelessness. It is released from all that is earthbound. It is completely unique. That is the secret of the Germanic-Nordic soul, the primal phenomenon, as Goethe would call it, beyond which we no longer seek, perceive or explain anything and which we should only respect in order to permit it to take its place within us.

The idea of the eternal personality is the strongest declaration of struggle against this world of appearances. The Indian, after he had distinguished between world and soul, rejected the former as deceit and mere appearance, attributing true reality only to the latter. The soul, the Atman, the Self, was, according to him, the Only-one. The Atman was fully and completely contained in a drop of water, in an animal, in a man. It was identical in all creatures of this world as something "ageless yet young," as the "primordial miracle." From this feeling of universality drifting into infinity, the difference of the races of man and spirit were overlooked. Earthbound diversities were regarded as delusions. They were declared, with the greatest spiritual power, to be non-existent. "That also art thou," is the Indian doctrine of the soul. It was boundless expansion following upon a philosophic intention never previously existent.

Philosophizing reason presses at all times toward binding the manifoldness of this world into a unity. It seeks to form experiences from observations and unity from diversity. India was predominantly philosophically oriented. It placed redemption not in a religiously-willed transformation but in an act of perception. Whoever saw through the appearance of this world was redeemed. This fundamental philosophic mood teaches that a multiplicity of souls—an idea which emerges in later times in the Samkhyam system—is wholly unacceptable in a philosophic sense. It is blasphemy. As such, it would also appeal to every philosopher who

was inclined only toward perception. The philosophy of reason as such will always aim at the monism of Indian or the material-worshipping kind.

The religious soul of the West is opposed to this outlook. This time we are seeking ideas in harmony with the teaching of Jesus: i.e., the assertion of the eternal personality in the face of an entire world. It comes, in its individual manifestation, from something unknown which rises within us—in innermost elevation—like the shadow of a memory. It has an unknown task to perform here on earth: to discharge its mission and to return again to its primordial essence. Every personality is a unity without end. That is the religious will as contrasted with philosophical monism. The monist stands alone in the universe. He returns home to what, in the language of religion, is called "the Father." What awakens philosophic resistance, is religious experience.

For this reason Jesus, in spite of all Christian churches, signifies a pivotal point in our history. He became the God of the Europeans. Up to the present he appeared in a repellent distortion.

If this concentrated feeling of personality which built Gothic cathedrals and inspired a Rembrandt portrait penetrated more clearly into the consciousness of the general public, a new wave of culture would begin. But the prerequisite for this is the overcoming of the former statutory values of the "Christian" churches.

The dignity of personality has nothing to do with the person. Otherwise the most worldly and materialistic men would believe in a personal immortality with all their power. But the latter desire only the extension of their animality into infinity. The greatness of Egypt, for example, is overestimated. Pyramids and mummification are not the expression of an other-worldly feeling of eternity. They are but a crass assertion of existence. The reason why Egypt became so incomprehensibly rigid was that everything was placed or forced into the service of this world. It was a state composed of officials and clerks. This also has its own kind of greatness, but of a totally different kind than that which the Romantics attempt to assert about Egypt.

In the ancient Indian doctrine, the concept of personal immortality is to be included. For if as plant, animal or man, I am yet always an Ego—a Self—that will be reborn, then something unalterable is assumed in which something alters reality. The concept of Karma, invested with many mysteries of the Buddhist philosophy, does not enlighten us here. The known parable of work and wagon is crassly materialistic and rests upon falsely concluded analogies. It is the "heart of our heart" which is reborn

to our faith. The doctrine of the migration of souls is therefore understood as a parable. If I recognize that I am bound here to forms of viewing things without which nothing is really conceivable to me (time, space, causality) then I would also not be able to grasp the truest answer, for it now presupposes completely different forms of outlook. If I speak about personal immortality and am confronted with the logical conclusion of the "Beyond," of accepting an ever larger mass of personalities, that all immortal personalities could thus increase—a hair-raising idea—or that a completely fixed number of immortal personalities exist who realize themselves in eternal recurrence, then the observation must be made that here notions are mixed. They arise in us under other conditions. We know nothing of the laws of the "other world" kingdom! Laws which have validity here—even the notion of "here" and "there" must be rejected—are inapplicable in "other" conditions.

In the idea of personality the metaphysical problem is condensed. Every man feels a number of formative possibilities within himself. He knows that many of his dispositions change and that other capabilities have, or could have, unfolded. Nevertheless, he recognizes himself again in every new deed. He knows that the structural lines of his essential nature remain the same. He sees himself as facing an apparently unconditional law. This inescapability from oneself and, again, the certainty of being a self, is the cause of the recognition of the freedom of will and the recognition of inflexible laws which dwell in a man.

Jesus was of the opinion that a thistle could not bear fruit. Thus, an evil man could not do good works. Nevertheless, he demanded inward transformation. Luther wrote a book about the lack of freedom of the will and the freedom of the Christian man. Goethe spoke his "primary words." Schopenhauer denied free will but reintroduced the moral order of the world.

For all Europeans, the last secret is contained in the concept of personality. Simultaneously, the conflict between freedom and unfreedom is, for us, only conditional. If we look away from purely external, mechanical influences which have effect upon us as organic creatures—this influence is smuggled dishonestly into the treatment of the problem of personality—then the grounds of dispute lie in that we judge ourselves in different situations from different viewpoints. If we feel the "unfreedom" of our nature, the unconditional urge to act in a specific way and not otherwise, then we unconsciously split our ego into two parts and feel the one burden upon us. Instead of saying to ourselves that we, as personalities, will ourselves to act so that this effect is an inner feeling developing through

time and according to external experience, each has created for himself his own law. That he created this law is the freedom of his personality. This recognition fits in exactly with the teachings of Master Eckehart.

Therefore, things are not as Schopenhauer teaches. He taught the empirical and intelligible character are two phenomena which exist outside the individual personality as universal empirical and moral world order, or, that accidental coincidence makes up a man, as the Indian Karma doctrine also asserts. When German folklore pronounces that each man is the smith of his luck, when Goethe speaks of the creative strength of a genius and when Eckehart demands that "each must become one with himself," these ideas are all fundamentally the same. It is the peculiar Germanic adjustment to the age old problem of man.

The idea of the immortal personality is not only a poetic creation. It is the highest religious flight which does not come into conflict with the strongest critique of perception. In the inorganic world the question as to a 'why,' as to a purpose, is senseless. But life—organic reality—cannot be grasped otherwise. Everywhere there is a realization of something that is always conditioned by a goal. Life is thus striving for a goal through unconscious purposefulness. Every creature receives instincts, which serve this quest for a goal. The belief in immortality breaks out again and again and directs us inwardly. This shows that it is a power given to us and one which already represents our immortality. A great natural scientist and thinker, Karl Ernst von Baer, declared in answer to the question about the essence of life:

> As self development does not consist uniformly in the attainment of a fixed form, but the organs are prepared for future use and the materials are constantly altered for self-formation, then the most general character of the life process seems to me to be striving for a goal. We will then not seek for the spatial seat of life as the life process can only take its course in the viewing of time. To comprehend how natural life consists in striving for goals, necessities and compulsively pursued aims, seems to me the true task of natural research.

Here we are faced with a test of character. Are we in the position of interpreting full-blooded racial life and its laws as an allegory of what is eternal or not? Can we experience our will to seek immortality as a means striving for a goal? Can we feel that, as life here already eliminates space, it also lies beyond the usual causality, that it still has permanency even after the removal of time?

A parallel example which clarifies the relationship even more distinctly is shown in the doctrine of predestination. It has taught the Western

world nothing more than that "God is in our bosom." This is not the opposite of the Ego but is the Self. Self determines goals through essential types. In the Jewish-Syrian-Roman world of ideas, which tears personality and God apart and opposes them hostilely, the idea of "predestination" became a ideal outlook which degraded man, condemning him to rebirth as a slave.

In the doctrine of predestination one "creature" was chosen forever by the spirit of an arbitrary creator while the other was damned for eternity. The 'why' remained a mystery known only to the instructing magician. Here we experience anew the catastrophe that occurs when a completely fixed idea is "assimilated" by an alien mode of thought. Intellectual and spiritual bastardization is then the inevitable consequence. The high respect that the Germanic personality has toward other races was deflected by alien races. The plastic possibilities of our essence are misdirected, causing much to perish which could have blossomed in accordance with its intrinsic nature. God be thanked that Augustine's monstrous doctrine of predestination has exerted no really lasting influence. This is an unconscious sign that our Nordic nature was not wholly abandoned to "Eternal Rome."

Only in strictly Jewish-Church "Christianity" does the separation of personality from God still live on, although the figure of Jesus demands this unity. Indeed, Jesus demanded this unity in a manner that is wholly unprecedented in history. He called for an absolute personality which lives freely according to its own law, as the master over the person. However, this signifies the strongest possibile contrast to the doctrine of "living of personality to the fullest" as our fashionable speech puts it. This guarantees mastery over life, not powerlessness of action. If one adds that this freedom is organically bounded by race and people, then we have before us the eternal prerequisite of every true-to-type cultural epoch of the West. The idea of the authoritative personality and the doctrine of predestination are closely linked with the concept of destiny.

Here, two incompatible world outlooks confront each other; the ancient Indian and the Hither-Asiatic. The Indian as a spiritual aristocrat attributed his earthly fate only to himself. If one asked an Indian who was born blind why he believes he has to endure this punishment, then he will answer that it is because he has done evil in an earlier life. Consequently, he must suffer a misfortune in accordance with his deeds. This completely logical idea eliminates externals completely, denies autocratically and, in particular, what we, who have grown up within the circle of church influences, are accustomed to describe as "merciless fate." This empha-

sizing of the responsibility outward is the unblessed legacy for which we have to thank the form of Christianity which brought the Hither-Asiatic world of ideas with it to Europe.

While the Homeric age still lived in communion with itself and the universe, Greek inner life was undermined by external upheavals. In Tragedy, personality and destiny therefore appeared in a dualistic manner. Innocent or guilty men are subject to the intrusion of external forces as, for example, in *Oedipus*. On top of this misery, yet another thing happened that split the soul. An alleged "representative of God" appeared. He taught the subjugation of the soul and the suppression of the human personality. Man was no longer responsible for his destiny and he was reduced to a condition of subservient humility.

Again, what was Germanic appeared in a dual antithesis toward these two types. It did not arrogate the right of declaring non-existent the physical universe and its laws. Nordic ideas knew nothing of Semitic fatalism or Syrian fate or magical delusion. It linked ego and destiny and declared them to be simultaneously existing facts without inquiring concerning the causality of both parts. The relationship of the Germanic peoples to the notion of destiny here was completely the same as it was in the later representation by Luther. It taught the existence of natural laws and personal freedom. The Nordic idea of spiritual conduct in the universe coincided with Kant's perceptive-critical investigations concerning the kingdoms of freedom and "natural necessity."

Perhaps nowhere is this essential harmony of everything Nordic-German revealed more clearly than in the comparison of the very oldest Germanic sagas and songs with Kantian thought.

Teutons fought Teutons, both sides believing that they had to fight for their freedom and honor. And the Germanic singer closes his song of destiny:

> Curse struck us, Brother, I had to kill thee,
> It will stay eternally unforgotten, hard is the saying of the Norns.

Here the Norns appear as the allegory of an unfathomable, and yet intuitively felt, necessity of cosmic-law. The fighting Teutons siezed this destiny and followed it without lamenting as free men. The sons of the Norland, Hamdir and Sorli who rode to the court of the king of the Goths, Ermanerick, to avenge the death of their sister, knew that they also rode to their death as they lent themselves consciously and freely in

service for the family honor. They fought until the last drop of blood. Sorli's last words were:

> Well have we fought, we stand on the corpses of the Goths,
> on those fallen in arms, like eagles on the branches.
> Good honor is ours, if the end comes today;
> None lives through the night, if the Norns have spoken.

These words are of an heroic, unsentimental self-confidence which finds its likeness in splendid heroic disposition only in the other Germanic songs, notably in the ancient *Hilderbrandlied*. Father and son confronted one another; the homeward-returning warrior and the protector of his hearth. The father recognized the son. However, the son saw in the father's welcoming words only a trick and incited the old hero. The father tolerated this until his son accused him of dishonorable disposition.

In fullfillment of the self-created law of honor, old Hildebrand saw the ruling destiny as an idea which reaches back to the profoundest Germanic mystery and the "uncreated soul" which he felt to be God—personal destiny. But at the same time, the heroic solution of the *Hildebrandlied* instructs the same as Kant on the supreme height of philosophic prudence. This was the realm of freedom and the realm of nature. These two were separated everywhere, but man belongs to both simultaneously. Kant showed belief in the sublimity of human nature, the consciousness of the value of the personality in the face of a terrible external power. L. Wolff notes correctly that the God called upon by Hildebrand is not the God of Christianity who apparently holds his mild-protecting hand over all the faithful. Through this Christian God the grasp of destiny has become, on the one side individualistic-egocentric, and on the other side, logical, leaning toward the doctrine of predestination. The old *Hildebrandlied*—as motif—later appeared among all peoples although often in falsifications which suppressed what is essential in the whole drama. In these songs the father only learns after he has done the deed that he has slain his own son, or, he recognizes him and after a short jousting, rides home peacably to his wife Ute. Here, Christian influence eliminating the ideas of honor are very clearly discernible.

Yet another aspect is shown by these Germanic songs—like the old version of the *Waltharilied*, the *Tale of Aldwin, Thuriskind* and all the others—that honor calls forth no conflicts. Rather, in the struggle upon earth, honor solved these conflicts. Germanic life became problematic only when new values were accorded attention equal to the highest

Germanic values of honor, freedom, pride and courage. This conflict, which pierced the heart of Europe, has remained, up to the present, the most significant reason that we do not have a soul-style, folk-culture and national State. Love and Christianity have not mended this "Germanic self-laceration." Instead, they are the cause of the struggle and the agony. For even at the time of the Folk wandering, the divided Germanic tribes felt their enmity with sorrow: "Curse struck us, Brother, I had to kill thee," sings the old Gothic minstrel. Theodoric then seemed once again to guarantee a Germanic unity until the Franks formed the Reich as a political clamp. Thus, the tragic conflict goes on. The possibility of enhancing the idea of personal honor, clan honor and family honor through a general Germanic consciousness of honor was—thanks to Roman Christianity—supplanted. Destiny and personality stand—according to Germanic comprehension—in constant reciprocal effect, and every truly Nordic drama will, in some kind or form, link outward events with inward character values, never allowing them to run unlinked to one another. This holds true just as much in the *Nibelungenlied* as in *Faust* and *Tristan*. A sugary aesthetics has also misunderstood this great drama and viewed it only from the standpoint of the enraptured Isolde. This, the greatest work of Wagner, is not a drama of love but of honor. Because Tristan feels his irrepressible love for the bride of his king and friend is dishonorable, he remains distant from her. He then wishes to drink the death potion when he recognizes the impossibility of becoming the master of his love. As the "truest of the true" he cast away this notion of honor which was the center of his life and abandoned himself to his passion. It represented an inexplicable, unsolved riddle symbolized through the love potion (Minnetrank). The inner high point of the drama is this moment, when Mark and Tristan stand opposite one another—not the Liebestod which signifies an end—while the king musingly asks the "truest of the true" why he abandoned honor.

And these sounds from the orchestra penetrate grievously into the metaphysical feeling as if they inquired after the deepest question of Germanic essence: how the "highest of all in honor" could become "honorless." This is something which is impossible and yet seemed irrevocably proven. This last question, in spite of the symbolic interpretation, remains without an answer. Tristan dies from his deed. He consciously takes death upon himself and tears the bandage from his bleeding wounds. He dies from the outward injury from one who is inviolable to him. Tristan dies of a conflict of honor, Isolde, of love's grief.

This is Germanic "destiny" and the Germanic overcoming of life through art. To shape all this into a form signifies the highest peak of the art of personality.

* * *

A view arose in the 19th century linked to the natural philosophers of the 18th century and outside the churches which, uncritical on all sides, made efforts to place the whole of man into some mechanistic natural law. This clumsy, materialistic attempt to preach an inescapable "economic law" can today be regarded as dead. However, in its place—through Spengler—another alluring outlook has taken its place. It is represented in the "Faustian man" and, gifted with considerable persuasive powers, it is the so-called morphological view of history. These historical teachers set up causality and destiny correctly as two non-coincidental ideas. They likewise further refute—in harmony with Germanic essence, loudly and openly—the Semitic fatalism which recognizes all causation as unalterable. But they place the idea of destiny in so-called culture-cycles. These cycles are certainly historically proven without—and here arises the dangerous error—examining the racial-organic of these culture cycles. According to Spengler, such a cultural cycle descends out of the misty distance into a piece of earth like the Holy Ghost. Those belonging to it experience an heroic era, an intellectual-cultural height, civilized decomposition and dicline. Deuctions concerning our future are drawn from these assertions. Irreversibility is represented as the essence of this "new" concept of destiny. In the end, we are confronted by the unexpected fact that Spengler has suceeded in introducing both the naturalist-Marxist as well as Magian-Hither-Asiatic concepts under a Faustian protective mantle. This inhuman doctrine of human causation lies in the ranks of purely mechanical causality. The doctrine of irreversibility must subject us to a fate. Spengler is not aware of the real Faustian "Alone, I will" (Allein ich will). He does not see racial-spiritual forces shape worlds. Rather, he invents abstract schemes—destiny—to which we have to subject ourselves. Logically in its conclusion, this doctrine denies race, personality, personal value and every really culture-promoting impulse—in a word, the "heart of the heart" of Germanic man.

Nevertheless Spengler's work was great and good. It broke in like a hail storm, cracked rotten branches, and fertilized the longing fruitless earth. If he is really great, then he should rejoice at this: To make things

fruitful—even if it be through error—is the highest mark one can aim for. But now the racial-spiritual awakening has grown far beyond the doctrine of "Morphology." It has found its way home to the primordial eternal words and, over epochs of confusion, greets men and art of past times as the living present.

* * *

Our previous digression was necessary because it established that it is not the "feeling of eternity and infinity" which is essential, but that personality, within similarly-conditioned individuals, represents the ultimate primal phenomenon of all artistic creation. The perspective on infinity by Lenotre and the dark mysteries of Rembrandt are not something merging into infinity but, among other things, they represent a tension of soul. It is remarkable how little heed the systematizers pay to the rhythm which all great artists of Europe followed half consciously, half instinctively. Their art does not run in a line from the material to the infinite. It returns to the self. It concentrates the spiritual powers always anew in order to flow them out fresh again. At the moment when Beethoven shaped tonal images in the highest peaks, near to sublimation, a jubilant *scherzo* suddenly intruded. In the midst of world-rejecting motives, a splendid struggling will resounds. These are not restraints but the life-rhythm of Western art. The *scherzo* of a Beethoven, the final concluding deed of the hundred year old Faust, the heroic greatness of Wagner's *Siegfried*, the smiling conquest of tragedy by Hans Sachs, the mysticism of Master Eckehart and his richly active life, can only be understood if every rigid monism is rejected. To thrust human volition into boundlessness as the "Western soul" is a fundamental attempt to weave nebulous Syrian magic into the culture of Europe.

The music of Bach and Beethoven is not the highest attainable stage of elevation of soul but it signifies the breakthrough of an unequalled spiritual power which does not merely strip off material bonds—that is only the negative side—but expresses something completely fixed, even if this cannot always be outlined in black and white. The Germanic conquest of the world is not boundless expansion but enhanced forcefulness—that is willed action—the "sweet sacred accord," to which Schubert attributed omnipotence.

The will is the soul-imprint of clear-sighted energy. Thus it belongs to the aim-setting mode of observation, while instinct is linked with the causal mode of thought. Even today, with the "resolute willed ego"

comprising every area of psychological study, the aesthetic will is denied. In this connection it is, if not the strongest, then it is certainly the most comprehensive, expression of the human will. Artistic creation is the conscious transformation of material through a unity bound through fixed forms in every art. If the other directions of the will have only one characteristic feature—the material— it is art that lays claim to substance and content. In the broadest sense, our entire formative appropriation of world and ego is a willed artistic activity. The mythical images of a god riding through the air in his thunder wagon and the marble Pallas Athena are both, in essence, consequences of the same formative activity. The idea of the law of the conservation of energy presupposes similar formative powers of soul.

An example is the *Prodigal Son*. This is a picture from Rembrandt's last year. He painted it in a condition of deepest poverty and despair. It was found after his death under a pile of rubbish. Here we see past life—concentrated into one moment—in the ruthless naturalistic representation of the kneeling sinner. From this ragged figure emanates a calm and enlightening victory over all that is frightening. Infinite love speaks from the visage of the kneeling father. Here, merciless naturalism with all its contingencies, and individual expressions and the perfect overcoming of nature, confront one another as in few portraits in the whole world of painting. Purely formal in draftsmanship and technique, everything runs from undetermined darkness upon the old man who, alone, is flooded with a gentle light. His visage and his arms, the whole range of tones from deepest brown, red and yellow find, here, their light-filled high point. The viewer's eyes halt here and focus on that point. Simultaneously the highest enhancement of the spiritual stepladder is present—from the onlooker's lack of participation to the deepest devotion to liberating, elevating redemption.

The formative spiritual activity which took place in Rembrandt has been continued in the souls of the two men, the son and the father. Here he has shown the successful reshaping of emotion into free action. Moral freedom has experienced an artistic mode of expression. Out of a moralizing allegory has come an artistic experience. For here we are not instructed that it is sinful to act in the manner that the son has done; humility is not preached to us and forgiveness is not recommended, but the free redeeming act of a man is presented and brought—with all means of formative penetration—into a most vital consciousness, just as the ancient myths did this with nature. Out of the same condition of soul in which Rembrandt found himself, a Schopenhauer would have laid

down the profoundest notions about the nothingness of the world, Christ would have taught forgiveness of all those evilly disposed toward us and Shakespeare would have written a shattering drama. But Rembrandt could only speak with his brush. It was a spiritual need in a completely fixed direction. It was not of a philosophical, not of a moral nature, but of an artistic nature.

For decades, Dostoevski's works have stood at the center of the most bitter disputes. Literature condemned his descriptions of horror and vice. They blamed his anxiety-making effect on the incomprehensible conditions of the Russian soul. Some have praised Dostoevski's characters as the prophets of a new religion. Some saw the sole measure of value in the apparently human-meaningful: others, in ruthless naturalism.

Insofar as the Dostoevskian men are Russian types and lay claim to validity as models of a new soul, we must react with the strongest objections against such a presumption. It is not acceptable if aesthetes, who apparently make efforts to strictly separate the "aesthetic object" from the non-aesthetic, complain that in reading Raskolnikov—in *Crime and Punishment*—one experiences being "softened in all fibres and crushed, squashed." Clearly in Dostoevski the heroic and moral object is confused with the aesthetic.

The fact is that purely physical effects of moral men are investigated while the formative strength, the aesthetic will, of the poet remained unheeded. Consequently, the *Crucifixion* by Grunewald would also have to be rejected as harmful because people fainted in front of it. In that painting we are spared nothing that is terrible, and, the old-sanctified "aesthetic balance" is ruthlessly attacked by this greatest work of old German paintings. But we should not feel the individual heroes or sacrifices, only the power which created them!

One cannot judge Dostoevski's work with human-moral measures nor with a measure of so-called objective form, but must finally resolve to judge his entire aesthetics of art through another mode of study as is attempted here. This is the recognition of a deep, inwardly willed, synthesis. Words of moral compensation, formal control, etc., are no longer in place here.

It was the principal mistake of the majority of aesthetes, that, in studying the characters of a drama or a painting, they pushed their own petty feelings and anxieties into the foreground, while ignoring the artistic power which created the works. The figures are alive—be they crippled or upright, good or bad—so long as we recognize the inner necessity of ourselves from the subject matter. The suppression both of

desire and noble stirrings of will does not occur in European art in order to make room for "instinct for play." It is much deeper interpretation of artistic willing. I should not enjoy a work of art perfunctorily and in the equilibrium of all spiritual powers. I should observe a creative formative power. My satisfaction does not consist in seeing appearances but having experienced the essence of the work. I must feel this essence manifest through appearances, summoned up within me. Aliosha, Dimitri or Ivan Karamasov do not interest me so much as the strength which motivated each of them through the organic creation, visible through human creative nature which makes its way into our heart. If I am to regard these figures as a life-ideal, then it is a completely different matter. If we set up the critical measure, then we do not affirm how strongly our "aesthetic freedom" has remained preserved, nor, if the characters are healthy or rotten, but only if they have a necessary effect. But here new aesthetic differentiations are applied. While we feel a ruthless will behind the wretched Prince Myshkin as a moral unity, we see behind Thomas Buddenbrooks only a pen-chewing aesthete in the lamplight, torturing his brain with nerve-exciting problems. Myshkin's epileptic attack is an inward convulsion. The disastrous tooth loss of the wretched Buddenbrooks is mere bad luck, wearisomely prepared, but nevertheless just plain bad luck. And while the behavior of the crazed idiot, Myshkin, at the corpse of his lover, signifies a spiritually necessary collapse, Thomas Buddenbrook, executed by Thomas Mann on the paving stones, makes an unpleasant impression on us as it is comic.

* * *

Our study of Dostoevski now leads to another question already fleetingly touched upon: How does it happen that repellant, indeed corrupt, characters can have an aesthetic effect? Or, how does it happen that works of art which deal with an external form that in no way corresponds to the ideal of beauty of the peoples, of the artist, and also teach no values such as we would demand from the moral aspect, nevertheless often awaken a powerful aesthetic impression? Schiller's answer, that we instinctively lay more emphasis on power than on conformity, touches on the essence of truth but does not explain it. For what seizes hold of us particularly is the inner law of the aesthetic condition, even if it represents an adoptive word or even a hostile value.

The figure of Shylock cannot "please" us as such since the thought of him contradicts our spiritual precepts. Seldom does a creation impress us

in the same degree as this figure, because it is racially-spiritually perfect in itself. It is outwardly conditioned, encompassing all Jewish racial features from the rock pictures of Egypt up to Trotsky. Spiritually, Shylock portrays the essence of the Old Testament ideal—as well as the essence of the figures from the *Talmud*—up to the modern Wall Street banker. This thousand year old organism represented in Shylock is also the new creation of the Jewish essence—just as the Margave Rudiger and Faust represented the Nordic. Shylock acts as he must; once brought forward he necessarily has an effect on us as a further evidence of the aesthetic will of the artist. The surmise by Schiller; that in great criminals we are impressed by the strength which, in its magnitude, reveals the possibility of a sudden alteration of character, is thus at fault here. Shylock can never transform himself. His body follows a commandment which, in the unalterability of his nature, has a similar effect as the law which prescribes his course. Shylock is thus both an individual as well as a type, both a Jew and Jewry as a whole. The same holds of Mephistopheles whose aesthetic impression likewise rests neither on beauty nor upon strength but on his inner necessity; on the artistic act which created him. Purely personal without becoming types are Richard II, Iago and Franz Moor. While the artist openly identifies himself with the heroic values represented by Rudiger or Faust, he faces the others as a purely spiritual-willed form. These figures in particular—also Hille Robbe, Peregrandet and Tartuffe—prove to us that, in the last analysis, we must seek the roots of aesthetic creation as well as those of aesthetic experience.

A middle position between Siegfried and Shylock is taken by the works in which the artist does not form his own supreme value in a struggle against other forces or places, but in which he has openly attempted to bring a borrowed soul-life into expression with its ultimate consequences. Here, the most disturbing problem of Western art history has become visible; the sufferings of Christ with their culmination in the Crucifixion.

With the church doctrine that Jesus consciously sacrificed himself for the whole of mankind, his martyrdom was described where possible to render evident the power of dedication. His sacrificial death elevated the idea of humility as a highest value, i.e., subservient self-abandoning love devoid of will. The recognition of this value was the characteristic of the Medieval church. It also became the adoptive value of the Western artist who, in his creations, sought to bring himself into harmony with it. As the symbol of special piety there arose thousands of Crucifixions which subordinated the figure of Christ to the doctrine of humility. The smiling blond child who often gazed at the world with "unhesitant heroism" was

transformed into a broken-down figure tortured by pain, with distorted features and suppurating wounds. The feeling of total collapse, of despair, of sacrificial death, became the medieval counterpart to the self-evident heroism of a Rudiger, Hildebrand, Dietrich or Siegfried. The greatest work of this kind which elevated this adoptive church value into an allegory is the Isenheim Altar. This work is the logical conductor of the ideal of humility embodied in an artistic will which, in upward soaring power, is unequalled in world history. The Crucifixion, as traditionally depicted, borders on a sickly excess of tension, both of material and of penetrative power by an artistic will. The many stab wounds on the body of the martyred Christ, and Mary sinking into a hypnotic sleep, represent the high points of "Christian art." But the entire work reveals the true artistic will in the Resurrection, in which a remarkable renewed transformation takes place. From the dark Jesus on the cross comes a luminous, slim blond, risen Christ. In a mystical circle of color he raises himself into the air again, incomparable to the symbolization of the will-less condition of collapse.

Since this great achievement, the adoptive value of the West has more and more lost its thrusting power. Crucifixion and Resurrection become almost purely decorative, occasions of beautiful color and light effects. The theme is exhausted, the inner drive to shape the Crucifixion is lacking in the present day world—along with the feeling of form. A Crucifixion in the true sense as Grunewald painted it—as art work and creed—can today neither be painted, carved, set to music nor written. Even the adoptive value has been given up. But an old, yet new, theme has appeared in this respect: Jesus the hero—not the flayed to pieces, not the magically vanished of later Gothic, but the unique, simple personality. The creation of this new heroic image is still not completed; but in Rudiger and, in Master Eckehart, it was already outlined in advance.

* * *

The classical German aesthetics from Winckelmann to Schopenhauer began with the work of art itself—even if only from the late Grecian. But this neglect of real life could not satisfy lastingly. The new aesthetes therefore transferred aesthetics, following the entire movement of the times more and more toward the feelings of the recipient of art, and, according to temperment, each of them discovered other experiences in himself. He then constructed a new, but once more, Universal Aesthetics. Thus Aesthetics became more and more a part of psychology, the alleged

science of knowledge of the soul. Alongside this, the sensualist conquered the ground step by step, which, in the face of the universally material-worshipping views of the last decades, likewise could not be questioned. Art became a counterpiece of the purely economic mode of thought since, as was said, its forms had the striving "to provide the richest possible content with a minimum expenditure of strength." The feeling of pleasure in art appeared as a result of an easing of mental activity. The subconscious-irrational was disposed of in a stopgap measure. Aesthetic feeling rested on inward imitation, on motor sympathy. Finally Muller and his adherents found, in the enjoyment of art, a general enhancement of the life-promoting feeling, thus moving very near to the essential recognitions, but always remaining caught up in mere psychology which caused them to overlook what is objective in the given art work. Groos went the same way. We have to thank Kulpe for an exact investigation into the associative values. In spite of his retention of the psychological mode of observation, he nevertheless directed his attention to art and demanded the dissection of the "beautiful" into its constituent parts. Similarly, Volkelt demanded norms in art "according to which one has to judge if one wishes to bring forth aesthetically pleasing effects." Other aesthetes aimed at the fathoming of beauty as an ideal quality of art objects. A Gothic cathedral consists of stones, a melody of tones. Neither stones nor tones are what is beautiful. Beauty adheres to the material where one cannot observe it with his senses. The "beautiful" consists not merely in the sum of the qualities of the individual parts but beyond this something determined. It is virtually independent of the parts.

This thing, released from the factual, aesthetic appearance, signifies the essence of the aesthetic object which arouses dual feelings of fantasy; feelings of empathy and feelings of participation. As a result, Witasek is on the way to an interpretation of art which has become widely diffused, i.e., the so-called "empathy" aesthetics. This school of thought was, in fact, largely founded by Lipps. According to him, the aesthetic condition is a feeling of joy which is to be attributed to the comfort of the soul, in the sense that the soul easily grasps everything which appears pleasant to it. The beautiful signifies life-activity, whereas ugliness is the denial of life. Therefore, the beautiful awakens feelings of joy whereas ugliness brings us displeasure. Here, an "empathy" already exists enhancing itself through delight with he who enjoys and a sadness with those who mourn. The possibility of empathy is dependent on approval on the part of one who enjoys art. Our own strength or longing must find its counterpart in the art work. Later, Lipps shifted his aesthetic investigations more and

more to the subjective and declared that every properly observed expression exists only in the observer himself: "All this is the placing of oneself into another. The individual strangers whom I know, are objectified . . . multiplicities of myself. Multiplicities of one's own ego, in short, are the products of empathy."

Aesthetic enjoyment is a form of spiritual self-satisfaction. Passivity and activity of the material become feeling-experience. Heaviness, hardness, etc., lose their objectivity and receive lyrical qualities of the ego: "The necessity in the objects . . . is felt into them and, according to their origin, is nothing other than the necessity experienced in us of our judgement . . . The objects are not . . . necessitating or necessitated, only I am this."

As a result, conditions are turned upside down. The attempts to perfect, to enlarge the psychological theory of empathy, to merge it together with classical aesthetics, have been numerous. Nowhere is the recognition more clear than in the dogmatic denial of the Volkish-racially-conditioned will. This recognition alone forms the bridge from the object to the subject; from the formative will of the artist—as the highest expression of strength—to the formative will of the recipient of art. This fact is nowhere more clearly proven than in music. This art is devoid of material. It has only spiritual content and form. Its means of representation are rhythms of time. Its legitimacy is tested by time. In his study, which must be regarded as one of the profoundest treatises on the essence of music, Schopenhauer declares that the effect of this art is so unique because it directs itself directly at the innermost heart, at the will. Here Schopenhauer has seen this correctly, without noticing that, as a result, he destroys both his philosophic system as well as his aesthetic creed. The "blind will" is set up in contrast to itself, as the holiest stirring of soul since every work of art signifies the conquest of everything impulsive. The effect of music as the greatest artistic experience on the will is represented by a thinker who, with virtually hypnotizing eloquence, had described the essence of the aesthetic condition as contemplation.

If we listen to real music it does not mean that we sink into contemplativeness, not even into sweet dreams. Through the universal medium of tonal shapes, we experience a formative will and a formative structure of composition. But this means even more to feel the formative powers awaken in the slumbering listener. It is similar for the artist. Music—and with it every other art—is a reinterpretation of the "world." It is a representation of the soul—from the uttermost stillness of a Fra Angelico and Raabe to the wildness of a Michelangleo and Beethoven. The artist

proceeds from the inward to the outward. The recipient moves from the outward—from the created work—to what is inward in order to arrive at the experience which pervaded the artist in the primal creation of his work. That is the sole true circulation of "aesthetic feeling." It is the supreme task of the work of art to enhance the formative power of our soul; to strengthen its freedom in the face of the world; indeed, to overcome the world.

What does it mean if, after visiting a portrait gallery, a man believes that he has aesthetically contemplated nature? Does this not say that power slumbering within him has been awakened, a power which was not sufficiently strong for a personal activity in the direction of artistic creation? To many men this spiritual experience comes only after leaving a work of art, i.e., after the elimination of material phenomena. And what is it supposed to mean; that an artist has had an effect upon others? Does that mean anything other than that a formative will was awakened which, until then, had slumbered and could only be awakened by an impact of a special kind? I naturally do not speak here of imitation of technique. Our entire capacity for remembrance could be drawn into this study. For example, it is true that a special sound or rustle has called forth an inner upheaveal, as, for example, a grenade explosion which buried a soldier and caused a nervous shock, so that a similar sound years later calls forth the same mental and physical effect. A formative power clearly exists, which, in connection with philosophy and aesthetics, deserves to be thoroughly considered.

* * *

This leads us to the cognate of the beautiful—the sublime. The sublime is another phenomenon which awakens a "disinterested mode of observation," but which is not the beautiful. This mode of observation is not calm or playful, but mobile.

Equilibrium, the harmony of the powers of disposition, only appears because of, and after, a conflict. If we simply see ourselves placed before something great, something unlimited and formless, then our imaginative power is incapable of seeing this as a whole. As creatures of the senses we feel ourselves diminutive and, through this feeling, another sentiment rises within us which says that we are infinitely more than mere creatures of sense, for it is indeed we who are aware of this limited side of ourselves.

Bold, overhanging rocks, thunderous clouds, hurricanes and the lashed up ocean are forces of nature. Against nature our physical powers seem infinitely small. But when we immerse ourselves in a study of this powerful phenomenon, we then experience an elevation of our spiritual powers. We discover in ourselves a completely different capacity to resist which gives us the courage to be able to reconcile ourselves with a seemingly all-powerful nature. "Thus the feeling of the sublime in nature is respect for our own destiny." One must follow the religious notions resulting from this, which lead to honor and respect, to a religion such as Eckehart believed. This feeling of the sublime is thus called forth through a discomfort which leads us to become conscious of our human superiority. Then we pass over into a feeling of joy. It all ends in a calm, disinterested contemplation. In conclusion, an equilibrium is established among our powers of disposition, not only between imaginative power and understanding, but also between imaginative power and reason: "Sublimity is that which directly pleases through resistance against the interests of the senses."

The sublime arises through a certain differentiation in that we transfer the feeling which reason awakens in us to the object. While the beautiful demands the representation of a certain quality of the object, the sublime consists "merely in the relation in which the sensuous is judged in the representation of nature for a possible super-sensuous use of the same where applicable."

Accordingly in art, as Kant asserts, the sublime can only appear in the struggle of the moral will against the sensual. If the moral will as such is dispassionate, signifying only the good sentiments, then its appearance must take on the form of effect. If the idea of good makes its appearance then it is in the form of enthusiasm. This enthusiasm is not moralistic but sublime. As Kant says,

> Ideal men appear in art as bearers of this feeling. They are the actual heroes of the tragic drama. They become heroes of freedom and martyrs, granting the sublime the upper hand over sensuousness. The sublime has a relationship to intellectual and rational ideas.

These remarks clarify Kant's views concerning two mental states which, distinguished from the instinctive, allow us to feel a harmony among our inward vital powers, placing us in a condition of involuntary contemplation. As far as the derivation of aesthetic judgements is con-

cerned, i.e., justification of their outlook, this is not the place to devote much time to them. However, it is important that Kant allows things to be held as beautiful,

> because in the face of nature one observes the same in forms and could pose various questions in viewing the same. On the other hand, the sublime in nature is improperly so-called and is only a foundation of the mode of thought of human nature. To become conscious of this allows the comprehension of an otherwise formless and unpurposive object.

These elaborations reveal to us that the same conflict existed in Kant as in Schiller: They cannot deny emotion in the face of the great figures of drama, but, with remarkable stubbornness, they wish to continually return to their conclusions as to "harmony of mental powers," instead of recognizing the spiritual-willed experience and the awakening of the active spiritual power as the essence of the aesthetic condition. Only hesitantly did our thinkers wish to allow sublimity to be held as valid in art. They took their examples only from nature because they experienced the feeling of sublimity merely as a reaction.

Let us stand facing a Gothic cathedral. Here we feel a massive overwhelming greatness. But these cathedrals are nevertheless deeds. They are a human art creation of the most powerful type. They are the artistic representation of a sublime feeling. Thus here, creation and emotion go back to their source. What impels me to respect is, in the last analysis, the knowing of myself to be one with the personality, the people, the man, the formative strength which reveals itself.

It is tempting at this point to insert a long digression on the creeds of artists concerning creation and experience since it is characteristic of guild aesthetics. Guild aesthetics overlooked these things, although it provides the essential foundations for all studies of art. This would enlarge the circumference of this chapter so much, however, that only a few allusions can be made here.

For example, in his correspondence we see Hector Berlioz as an artist striding through all heights and depths. He is everywhere action, experience. After listening to one of his own compositions he related to his friend Ferrand that he could have cried out, so colossal and terrible was the effect upon him. He remarked contentedly that, as listener, he became as pale as death with emotion. From Lyons, Berlioz writes long-

ingly: "I believe I would become insane if I were to hear my music again." He wrote in ecstasy to R. Kreutzer:

> Oh Genius! What then shall I do, if one day I wish to describe passions? I shall not be understood, for they have not even greeted with garlands the author of the most glorious work, nor carried him around with triumph, nor thrown themselves on their knees before him.

In 1856 he admonished Theodor Ritter:

> Keep the 12th of January in your memory! That is the day you have approached the miracle of great dramatic music for the first time. You have received the first premonition of the sublimity of Gluck. I will never forget that your artistic instinct has unhesitatingly paid homage with rapture to this genius who was still unknown to you. Yes, indeed, be convinced that whatever people who possess half a passion say, there are two great higher divinities of our art: Beethoven and Gluck.

Berlioz will now perhaps be called excessively sympathetic, even proud. However much all his powers of will were applied toward creation, the seemingly sober Flaubert expressed himself likewise:

> For an artist, there is only one way: sacrifice everything for art! For 14 years I have worked like a mule. I have lived my entire life in the service of will, with exclusion of my other passions which I locked into cages and which I went alone occasionally to respect. You are fortunate, you lyricists, you have an outlet for your verses. If something torments you, you spew out a sonnet and that lightens your heart. But we poor devils, we prosaic ones, to whom every personality is refused—above all, myself—think of all the bitterness which falls back upon our souls, on all the moral phlegm which grips us by the throat.

Scarcely anyone has described the hour of birth of a great work so beautifully as Nietzsche:

> Has anyone at the end of the nineteenth century a clear notion of what poets in strong eras called inspiration? Revelation is in the senses that something that is an indescribable certainty and freedom, something that becomes visible, something perceptible to the ear, something which shakes and overturns one's innermost heart . . . one hears, one seeks not; one takes, one asks not who gives here; like a flash of lightning an idea appears, with necessity,

> unhesitatingly in form, I have never had a choice. A rapture whose enormous tension realizes itself in a torrent of tears, by which the stride now involuntarily storms forward, then becomes slow; a perfect being outside of oneself . . . a depth of happiness in which the most painful and gloomiest does not take effect as contrast but as conditioned, as challenged, as a necessary color within such a superfluity of light . . . All occurs in the highest degree involuntarily, but as in a storm of feeling of freedom, of unconditionality, of godliness.

This is the unleashing of the same essence which once caused Lenau to proclaim after a performance of Fidelio: "Then I was again seized by a storm of feelings and for two hours certainly the happiest man on earth. . . when I think back to such enjoyments, then the courage fails me to dispute with destiny!"

And Beethoven himself, the man who, by his works, conclusively shattered the foundations of aesthetics aiming at "contemplation" and "harmony." He expressed himself as follows to the young musician Louis Schlosser:

> Your wish to ask me from whence I take my ideas? That is something I cannot say with reliability. They come unsummoned, directly, indirectly. I could grasp them with my hands, in the freedom of nature, in the woods, on walks, in the stillness of the night, in the early morning. I am stimulated by moods which poets set to words but which I set to music—ringing, roaring, storming, until the finally stand before me in tones.

After listening to the E flat from the B flat Major Quartet, Op. 130, Beethoven said to Holz: "Never has my own music made such an impression on me; even feeling myself back to this piece always costs me a tear." Nevertheless, he then goes on to protest against all sentimentality and impulsive show of emotion when on the 15th of August, 1812, he writes to Bettina von Arnim:

> I have expressed my opinion to Goethe as to the reason why applause has an effect upon such as us and that from a man like him we wish to be heard with the intellect. Emotion is fit only for women in drawing rooms: with a man, music must strike fire from the spirit.

This was evidence of the Germanic conquest of nature.

Finally, what would the greatest poet among the Germans and the most sensitive diffuser of their soul say about the attempt to destroy the sublimity of the heart as a result of the artist's life being degraded to a

disintegrating nothingness? Holderlin himself had already suffered from these men at a time when they still did not rule as almighty citizens over our life. Even Hyperion in his search for great souls, had to confirm that they had become only barbaric through diligence, science, indeed, even through their religion. Craftsmen, thinkers, priests, title-bearers, were what Hyperion found—but no men, only piecework without unity of soul, without inner drive, without life-totality. Thus even virtues appeared as a glittering evil and he was shattered to discover that these men even wished to elevate their narrowness of mind into a law for the whole. What would Holderlin have felt at a later time, when art slid down from the heights of the theoretically conceded "inducing of contemplation" as a neutral domain to the level of furtherance of the digestion, or of increasing foreign tourism, of the bacchanalia of noise technology? Once, he wished to present the genius of Greece to his *Diotima* and was only able to give birth to a song of lamentation of a wounded mind. Today his work would be the sole cry of despair—or of attack—even more the outpourings of a glowing innermost torment of will. But the beauty which Holderlin felt as religion was not the "contemplative" satiety of our philosophizing doctors, but the highest enhanced life-totality; a bundle of all elevations of soul tied together for a brief moment; of all longings of the heart; of all sinew-cords of the will. And Holderlin's poems were a tiny radiant rising of the supreme values of life and a divine longing for the distant: a summons to the "giant heart" of the world. He knew what he said when he wrote about the "clever givers of advice."

In this way one can pass through the longing, creating and experiencing of all real artists of the West. Everywhere at the beginning stands the concentrated artist's will, ready to become master of a great display, to knead it, to shape, to bring forth a new creation and then, in this dissolution of the aesthetic will—in accord with the total willing—to prepare his bliss.

This deep willed artistic power is faced particularly by a hostile assertion, delivered again and again by our modern aesthetes with predilection: the view that there exists an unmoralistic or amoralistic spirit. This view, which is obviously of purely individualistic nature, goes back to the attempted loosening of the artistic will from the essence of the will generally. One does not err in discerning there a feature of the impure Mediterranean race which is spread particularly by the Jewish literary guild. Nordic-Germanic art attacks, from the beginning, this assertion as a lie on the basis of spiritual content alone. One should read Wagner's letters to Liszt in order to measure how deeply true race separates itself

from asphalt intellectualism. One should also take note of Beethoven's words:

> Handel is the greatest composer who ever lived. I want to lower my head and kneel upon his grave. Mozart's greatest work remains the *Magic Flute*. Here he first revealed himself as a German Master. *Don Giovanni* has a completely Italian style and, along with this, our sacred art ought never to allow itself to be degraded to the folly of such a scandalous subject.

Only on the foundation of this character have the great creations of the Germanic West arisen: the cathedrals as well as the dramas and symphonies. The greatest conscious sensual attempt to awaken this sublime will is with Wagner's music drama. Wagner declared dance, music and poetry to be one art and attributed the fragmentation of his times to the fact he believed that each one of the three arts had been isolated. They had arrived at the last boundaries of the capacity for expression and had distorted themselves.

Beethoven's absolute music led the Master to this recognition as we see in the 9th Symphony with its unprecedented use of voice. The music alone lacks the "moral will." Its isolation signifies chaos or empty program music. Drama, alienated from music and dance—the most perfected shaping of lyricism—necessarily arrives after its loosening from the "other" arts, and only in the written tragedy which before could not be represented. This was Goethe's failure, just as it was the failure of his successors. The dance was originally only real and full-blooded as the national dance. It was linked to folk music and song. It became—thanks to this release—a motion of the legs alienated from nature without spiritual content and real rhythm. Wagner therefore saw the art work of the future in the union of the three arts.

Wagner fought against a completely plebianized world and triumphed. The cultural work of Bayreuth remains forever beyond question. Nonetheless, a retreat begins today from the basic teachings of Wagner, against the assertion that dance, music and the poetic art are forever bound in the manner proclaimed by him; against the assertion that Bayreuth was, in fact, the unchangeable "perfection of the Aryan mystery." Two facts show us that the form of the Wagnerian music drama has not always been completely successful—as in *Tristan and Isolde* and the *Meistersinger*. He also created a drama which reached out so high that it must fail: *Ring des Nibelungen*. This proves that, just by the linking of word and music, the dance is mastered in its general form as a dramatic gesture.

The word, in addition to its innate musicality, is always the bearer of a thought or feeling. However much one would like to regard language bearing thought as a "non-aesthetic" mode of expression it is nevertheless the precondition of every real drama. Its clarity and possibility of comprehension determine the height and width of the auditorium. The technique of language is held to be the prerequisite of every great aesthetic representation. The formative will of the poet emerged only through the medium of language. As long as the word describes a human conflict, relates an event or mediates a thought process, it is not furthered by music. Any accompanying music destroys the medium of the transference of the will and thoughts. This is revealed in the narration by Tristan in the first act, in Wotan's Dialogues with Brunnhilde, in Alberich's curse and in the song of the Norns in the Prelude to the *Twilight of the Gods*. Everywhere that there is the medium of a thought-structure the orchestra steps in the way. The same holds for almost all crowd scenes. In powerful swelling-up tonal pictures, the assertions of the people vanish completely. The public only hears inarticulated loud outcries and sees only upraised hands. This does not lead to form, but to chaos. One should compare, for example, the beginning of *Egmont* with Brunnhilde's arrival at the castle in Burgundy. Goethe's crowd scene shows the greatest plastic liveliness. A few words from the left and the right represent the thoughts and the mood of whole human classes. The community in *Egmont* gives to this individual a real penetrating strength. A musical accompaniment during this mass scene would rob it of every measure of character.

Apart from the expectation that Brunnhilde reveal her secrets of soul before the assembled people, her gestures—accompanied by music—develop in the word-tone-drama into a constricting scene which is not criticized solely out of enthusiasm for the will of Wagner. Here the tone has killed the word.

This occurred because it was dogmatically asserted that during the music drama, the music must not cease for a moment. However much this is justified in the siezures of leadership at the beginning of the *Rheingold,* in the second and third act of *Tristan* and in the third act of the *Meistersinger*, a barrier is formed, preventing the word from guiding one into the soul of Tristan, Mark and Hans Sachs. Beethoven's music for *Egmont* is the deepest of all music drama. But this music would not enthral the listener to such an extent if the conflicts between Egmont and Orange or between Egmont and Alba were accompanied by the orchestra.

Along with the dance, drama is the sole art in which the living man is the means of representation. It has the task not only of having dramatic effect in time but also spatially through gestures. Motion is a function of space and time. It is the one form of viewing capacity in which a definite relationship of one part to another is established. The effect expressed in words demands unconditionally a strong outward movement of the entire man. The speed of alteration in space corresponds to the tempo of inner experience. In spoken drama it is possible to establish these space-time relations unhindered. One's natural rhythm and motives (kinetic factor) are awakened by the spoken drama.

For a long time the importance of motive factor had been exaggerated when sensualist-psychological aesthetics ruled the field. The "classical" reaction, however, pushed it again much too far into the background. Without a doubt, this motive—the awakening of man—is the external expression of the highest willed instinct. The trumpets which sounded the attack and the *Hohenfriederberger* march to whose sounds millions have gone to their death, show how much the heroic sound can produce a will which transforms itself kinetically into the highest bodily tensions of energy. To this same inspiring drama belongs the rhythm of the true national dance. To these sounds the people concerned answer spiritually and emotively. Time and space also stand in a fixed relationship here which is not hampered by other factors. But if the music joins the word-drama and the word dance-music, not during shorter sequences of time, but lastingly, then it is that artistic discords arise unavoidably. The old opera in which a hero announces his flight and yet stands still for ten minutes has been dismissed laughingly. But in Wagner's drama the inner harmony between word content and physical conduct is often frequently hindered by the music. When, for example, Brunnhilde suddenly sees Siegfried at Gunther's court and passionately approaches him, the words of her song hinder the course of the movement. Moreover, Siegfried must ward her off by gesturing in slow motion, so to speak. This holds true of most scenes in *Rheingold* between the gods and the giants.

If, in these cases, the music disturbs, as if bound to the songs, to the ebbing of a spiritual motive, then the word cannot follow the speed of the dance. The latter must thus allow a falsification to please, a case which certainly seldom appears in music drama.

These observations do not signify a criticism of unimportant things. They are aimed at some essential which Wagner and every opera singer has certainly painfully felt. It has been asserted that the three acts are not compatible but, irrespective of how they may have stood to one another in

earlier times, the law of necessary form can be disregarded by none of them without artistic damage for they are not in fact one art. An attempt to wed these arts forcefully destroys spiritual rhythm and prevents emotive expression and impression. Wagner, whose entire art work is a continuous and enormous outpouring of will, frequently gets in its own way. In a strange paradox, some of Wagner's greatest strengths are also weaknesses. The majority of participants in the Wagnerian music drama unconsciously feel this without being able to explain their feeling of being ill-at-ease. Wagner's incomparable, impressive mystical-heroic passages predominate yet also override some of the previously established relationships between time and space. These remarks are in no way intended to denigrate Wagner's work. It created life and that is decisive. It was also a blessing that the previously isolated arts have been unified, and have thereby actually fortified one another. Perhaps one day another great man will come, one who will reach into contemporary life and, with regard to the newly experienced inner law of the three arts, present us with a new form of word-tone-drama using *Egmont* and *Tristan* as models.

The essence of all Nordic Western art has been revealed in Richard Wagner. It shows that the Nordic soul is not contemplative, that it does not lose itself in an individualistic psychology. Rather, it experiences the willed cosmic-spiritual laws and shapes our art spiritually-architectonically. Richard Wagner is one of those artists in whom three factors coincide, each of which form a part of our entire artistic life: the Nordic ideal of beauty as it appears outwardly in *Lohengrin* and *Siegfried*, linked to deepest feeling for nature; the inner will of man in *Tristan and Isolde*; and the struggle for the highest value of Nordic-Western man: heroic honor, linked with inner truthfulness. This inner ideal of beauty is realized in Wotan, in King Mark and in Hans Sachs. Conversely, *Parsival* is a strongly emphasized weakening of the will in favor of an adoptive value.

Here Wagner's soul life coincides with the deepest undertones of great European men. I will not record their names again. "The highest one can attain is an heroic course of life." confessed even Schopenhauer. This strength of the heroic will is the mysterious medium which has directed all our thinkers, researchers and artists. It is the spiritual content and longing in the greatest works of the West from Count Rudiger up to *Eroica, Faust* and Hans Sachs. It is the strength which determines everything. The ultimate goal of Western art creation is the awakening of the spirit. This recognition stands as remote from the alienation from life by our classicism as from the superficial sensuous art and formalism of

today. It compromises both and goes into the depths with them where they find all that was created from the essence of the Nordic-Western soul.

* * *

What is shown in an unleashing of will among the greatest is also the essential commandment for all other true artists of the West. This commandment applies equally to those whose spiritual driving power does not reveal an equally strong, although identically directed, formative will. The result is unique. It is the agreeable, the intimate, the humourous.

I have yet to find the products of other races—indeed, even of related groups of peoples—which can be described with these words: A little Gothic gabled house with dormer windows and small frames, the alcoves, carved doors, the inlaid trunks and chests and the painted wood panels. Rooms with low ceilings which look into the neighbor's kitchen. Add to these the stories by Gottfried Keller, the poems by the pastor Worike who loved the birds so much and wished to have all his possessions together with him in one narrow room; the poems of Raabe, the art of Dickens, the paintings of Cranach—everywhere we find the quietly working Germanic personality taking effect in its essence as pleasant and agreeable. As Raabe wrote,

> In the narrowest ring
> Many a worldwide thing.

But the quietness of these artists is nevertheless not the same as "classical repose." Certainly in all that is Germanic there also exists a deep longing for the "oceanic calm of the heart." For hundreds of years Germanic men have wandered over the Alps. The eyes of countless generations have been turned towards Hellas. But nothing is more superficial than to say that the German seeks his lost essence, his lost model of conduct and his lost sense of harmony. No! The longing for rhythm, the expression of a strong-willed soul always forms the basis, and reveals this search as a longing not only for the unveiling of one's own essence but for its imprint of a seeking after its complimentary elaboration. The eternally searching and active Nordic man seeks repose and is often inclined to value it higher than everything else. But once he has gained it by struggle he does not allow it to capture him. He seeks, researches and shapes further. "No rest!" wrote Beethoven in 1801 to Wegeler. "I know of no other rest than sleep and it causes me woe enough that I must devote to it

more than otherwise." And if he is "quiet" then it nevertheless wells up further in the depths, always ready to be transformed into active, creative outflow. Germanic art is deep and active, the will given form. Dickens gilds men and the world with eternal, but with a completely and absolutely un-Grecian beauty. His sense of inward beauty is a play of will, first darker, then brighter and vividly toned, but always linked with effervescent action. *Bleak House* is perhaps the most precious fruit of this art of an even more penetrating atmosphere than *David Copperfield.* Even under the pleasant fact of Raabe an active longing seethes in *Abu Telfan* which swells up in *Die Innerste* in a dramatic crescendo. No so very profound, although stronger in pathos, is C.F. Mayer's poetry as in the soul searching *Die Richterin, The Monk's Wedding,* and *Jurg Renatsch.* Keller, like a Gothic wood carver, planned out his eccentric figures, cut remarkable folds in their faces and then sent them out into the unsentimental world. It is the fullness of life which is produced by the Germanic soul, culminating in such artists as Mermann Lons who heard the soul of the earth speak within himself. It is this natural-mystical side which is just as perceptible in Lons as in Goethe's *Uber allen Gipfeln is Ruh . . .* ("On every treetop is rest . . . ") and *Damm'rung senkte sich von oben* ("Twilight sinks down from above"). In the most concise description, eternal willing is present, eternal movement is concealed and the "werewolves" act just as much according to their innermost will for spiritual-racial freedom as a Faust who must fathom the entire world. Again, Raabe, living in outward quietude was a true *Hungerpastor,* hungry for world-wisdom. "Look up to the stars!" he instructs. "Pay heed to the alleys," is the echoing rejoinder. He sees true harmony not only in oceanic calm, but also in the furious storm which drags men with it, and gives his hero Robert Wolf the watchword on his path through life: "Forward, even in chains!" Through Gottfried Keller's creations, which seem to stand so clearly demarcated in the warm sun, flows the perceptible undercurrent of a self-evident heroism. *Julia und Romeo aud dem Dorfe* is such a piece of unsoftened greatness and *Frau Regula Amrain* is an example of inward pride. The girl who sits weaving her wedding linen and works her love into it, sings that if her husband will not fight for his fatherland, then her wedding linen should become a shroud. And the shepard who high above in the mountains builds ever anew his hut destroyed by avalanches and tolerantly looks on, declares: "If the avalanche of servitude falls upon my country, then I will myself set fire to the homestead and move out into the wide world."

The Nordic man in middle-class garb is a humorist. Admittedly, there is a growling and lamenting in his depths but the effervescence is checked by a conscious self-control and gilded by human understanding. Goethe could be just as much a humorist as Leonardo or Shakespeare. Cervantes is not a humorist as many still believe. But profound humorists like Gottfried Keller, Wilhelm Busch, even Charles Dickens and Spitzweg, nevertheless belong in the gentle thundering of the European essence. They are serene points of rest on dark ground. The forest is still movement, rustling rhythm, play of light and shadow, clear guiding of lines and dark mystery. As a Volk-unit the people are struggling, triumphing, defeated, laughing and mourning. Their life goes down in cascades or flows in broad streams. And nevertheless, it is a water which reflects character. Thus the quietness of storm and Raabe and Keller belong alongside the greatness of Goethe and Wagner; the smiling tragedy of Busch alongside the pathos of Schiller. A dark undercurrent of the blood and soul binds them all and, even the "quietest" of them sounds the German song of eternal becoming and struggle for being.

In no other living artist is this mystical-natural expression of the will shaped more imposingly than in Knut Hamsun. No one knows why, with great effort, the farmer Isak cultivates one piece of land after another in god-forsaken regions or why his wife has joined him and gives birth to his children. But Isak follows an inexplicable law. He carries on a fruitful quest out of a mystical primal will. At the end of his existence he will certainly look back in astonishment at the harvest of his activity. *The Growth of the Soil* is the great present day epic of the Nordic will in its eternal primordial form. Nordic man can be heroic even behind the wooden plow. Every stirring of his muscle bears fruit. Benoni, Mack the merchant, Baroness Edvarda and Glan the huntsman—each personality has received an inner law breathed into it from the beginning and acts accordingly. It does seemingly incompatible things—yet these acts are nevertheless self-evident. One does not even need to explain them "psychologically." Their exterior is itself the inner will. The vibrating of our will with the strength which created everything is the actual "aesthetic experience." *Vagabonds* appears as a counterpiece to the character of the earth-immersed Isak. In the same medium *Hamsun*, in a mysterious natural insight, describes the laws of the universe and of the soul. Once again the characters are peasants, fishermen, merchants, in whom a world is reflected. Through travel, through unsatisfied longings, they lose contact with Mother Earth whose blessing is no longer with them. They move from place to place, exchanging activities and loving. But since the

roots are torn out of the strength-giving earth, the blossoms also die. So they live their lives—Edvart, August, Lovise Margrets—without knowing why and without direction. They are symbols of decline, transition in the best case, experimental fragments of mankind, arriving at new forms and types, but unable to create values or gain honor. They live as the past for the past has captured them, self-evidently and mysteriously. Yet the Nordic spirit is never fully repressed or lost.

And finally that longing! It is longing which drives an artist's heart to creation in exactly the same way that it sends explorers out on journeys of discovery. The entire German Romantic movement is just as inconceivable without the sense of longing as was once the Gothic. Holderlin is the greatest among the artists of longing in our times. This primal element of his nature always breaks through irrespective of whether he sees the dream image of Hellas as embodied in Diotima or sings his *Song to the Germans*. A Holderlin would not at all grasp what was meant if one were to speak in his presence of 'contemplation.' On our side we would have understood nothing about him if we had not experienced the aesthetic-willed longing element of his creations in the depths of our own vital longing. It is this primal urge which also created two products of the contemporary German value-creating literature: Hans Grimm's *Volk ohne Raum* and Erwin Kolbenheyer's *Paracelsus*. The bells which resound from the village on the Weser and accompany Cornelius Friebott through the world are the expression of the longing for space, for plowland, for the use of inborn creative powers. These bells of longing from Lippoldsberg also ring out, mourning the death of he who sought to awaken the Volksspirit of all racially Nordic Germans, no matter where they live and even if from a formal-technical aspect there are some things to be regretted in *Volk ohne Raum*. Its portrayal of the human character may lag somewhat behind Sigrid Undset's *Kristin Lavransdotter*—whose character representations, for example, of Erland Nikulaussohn, are masterworks. The primal longing is absent in the Norwegian authoress, whereas it is evident in every page of Grimm's work. The more her characters speak about faith and theology, the more the reader comes to believe that her intentions are attempts to transfer her ideas into the innermost heart of figures who do not appear as carriers of basic feelings of life. And it is here, where Kolbenheyer, returning into the Middle Ages, draws close to Grimm. Kolbenheyer makes the eternal wanderer speak to the God on the cross: "There is no other people like this, which has no gods and yet eternally desires to see God." He takes the weary Christ, who lies begging at the wayside, in his strong arms and carries him through the

German lands. The wretched, tormented figure of Christ inhales the strong breath of this German genius and becomes stronger and more powerful. He then speaks about the Germans:

> They do not recognize me any more, for they have only tongues for their eternal gods which carry the seal of death. Everything else seems small to them. But they see me. This people's blood still has so much that is pristine, primordial in its source, flowing through its veins! They must be thus because they are men who are filled with longing . . .

From this world vision the great searcher Paracelsus arises from the poet's imagination and stands on the threshold of two great epochs, gazing beyond both with a longing toward a time when word no longer stands against word, altar against altar. This will must be fitted into the primal laws of life.

Does anyone believe that a Kolbenheyer could have written his great work out of mere artistic enjoyment and because he himself is a man filled with a tremendous longing? And does anyone not believe that they understand his work who have not felt the same power of longing grow within them? Whoever believes that has not only not understood this "novel," but has not even remotely grasped the essence of Germanic art. They grasped neither Ulrich von Ensingen nor Meister Erwin nor the poet of *Faust* nor the creator of *Hyperion*. Since they possessed this feeling none of them wished that the result of their creations be "contemplation," not that thought. He conceived of things in a purely intellectual way. Such thinkers awake a longing for the willed side of our nature, away from the dullness of ordinary feeling. We expand it in one direction, holding it high and, in this production of strength, create an active spiritual life.

* * *

It is a significant world-historical fact that however religious the European of earlier times was, however much a religious longing is again occurring (admittedly still concealed for many, but nevertheless in many places deep), however many mystics and devout men the West produced—absolute religious genius or completely autocratic embodiments of the divine in one man, is something that Europe still does not possess. However richly talented, however powerful in forms and in surpassing it was, until the present, we have still not created a religious form worthy of us. Neither Francis of Assisi, Luther, Goethe nor Dostoevski are founders

of a religion for us. No Jajnavalkya, Zarathustra, Lao-Tse, Buddha or Jesus has arisen in Europe.

Europe's religious search was poisoned at the source by an alien-raced format. Its first mythological epoch is nearing its end. Western man could no longer think, feel or pray in forms which were true to his type. After a violent, unsuccessful defense he was saddled with the substitute belief of the church which had been forced upon him. A rich treasury of legend flowered on the stony ground of the Jewish-Roman dogmas. Magnificent figures with intuition and the reshaping of the true Jesus were cast against the rigid Syrian superficialities. Heroes were convinced to fight and to die for their adoptive beliefs. The deeds of the rich merchant's son from Assisi were not creative. Neither were these deeds an aristocratic overcoming of the world like the action of the Indian who smilingly laid himself in a grave he had dug. They were only a denial of the world and the suppression of the Self. That is the tragic song of all European saints. It is a purely nihilistic side of Western religious life. The European could not have positive creative effect on the world that was true to his racial type. Whenever he attempted it, as in the shape of the "blessed master" Eckehart, the church values vanished and dissipated. Even the promise of a new religion easily overcame the alien church although it had to build and grow under its ban. This apostle of the Germans died before he could fully and consciously instruct the people in the new religion.

So Europe then went down and physically subjugated the world and universe. But the spiritual search which was not truly religious, but only Roman-Jewish, displaced the equilibrium of the religious and artistic will. India's hymns of antiquity are less art products than religious-philosophical creeds. China's images of the gods remain as a grotesque distortion of nature or are elevated to mere forms of stylization and formalization. Greece became an abstract form for us. In Europe alone art became a true medium of overcoming the world: a religion in itself. Whereas Egypt's paintings were mere compositions of draftsmanship, Grunewald's Crucifixion, a Gothic cathedral, a self-portrait by Rembrandt, a fugue by Bach, the *Eroica* of Beethoven, the *Chorus Mysticus* in Goethe's *Faust*, are all allegories of a completely new soul, of a constantly active soul to which Europe alone was given birth.

Wagner longed for folk art as a symbol. The common original source of the individual arts appeared to him to proclaim a new epoch.

> We are not at first able to create this 'religion of the future,' because we are still only isolated, lonely ones. A work of art is the living

representation of religion, but religions are not invented by the artist, they only arise from the people.

Once Wagner wanted this: an art as religion. Alone with Lagarde he later struggled as an individual against the entire bourgeois-captialistic world of the Alberichs and, with his talent, felt he undertook a task in the service of his people. He did not say in a state of collapse: "I no longer understand the world." Rather, he wished to create another world. He had a premonition of a new, awakening life. Against him stood a world press which had sold itself out, a sated Philistinism, an era completely devoid of ideals. Even if the people of our times felt themselves estranged from the forms of the Bayreuth idea or unsympathetic to it, this idea has been the real source of life in the midst of a barbaric time. In all states where there lived men who confronted life not only by aesthetics and uncreative protests, Bayreuth found harmonizing souls. While the oft acclaimed "social poets" maintained only a pathetic existence, the inner value of Bayreuth still rises as a guide to our times. It still gives life, reaching beyond into the future of the coming German Reich.

Gerhart Hauptmann merely gnawed at the rotten roots of the 19th century middle-classes and constructed theatrical pieces from newspaper reports. He "educated" himself, then abandoned the struggling social movement. He was aestheticized to our values in the steamy Galician circles of the *Berliner Tageblatt*. He mimed the posture of Goethe before the photographers. Then, in 1918, after the victory of the bourgeoise, he allowed himself to be set up before the German people by the financial press as their "greatest poet." Inwardly worthless, Haputmann and his circle are unfruitful disintegrators of a time to which they inwardly belong. In none of them—neither in the Sudermanns or Wedekinds, certainly even less so in the later swarm of Mann, Kaiser, Werfel, Hasenclever and Sterheim—did a true protest flame up in the heart.

Although Marxist Socialism failed politically it was able to abort the Germanic renewal movement. Although this movement struggled for artistic expression it was betrayed and falsified by this arrogant Marxist Hebrew literary guild. All these "workers poets" died inwardly before the power of money and its slaves. These "poets" only pretended to fight. They are all intellectual upstarts who became well-endowed and "human" as soon as they were allowed to eat at the table of the princes of money. The revolutionary features of *Die Rauber*, of *Kabale und Liebe*, indeed even of *Wilhem Tell* are not to be traced in the 19th century. The creation of the prostitute Lulu is the highest to which these "poets" could

attain. But in order to suppress what was truly daring and struggling, the princes of money formed a cartel with Jewish theatre directors and press lords. The latter praised everything that is insolent, corrupt, artificial, impotent and crippled. It fought ever more resolutely and consciously against every true renewal of the world as it once had against Richard Wagner. For they knew that what is great means the death of what is small. A new value once recognized, obliterates what is worthless.

In this greatest struggle we live and breathe today more than ever. We can no longer shut ourselves off and become forgetful of the world or from the flow of life. We, in fact, can no longer do this since we know that an entire International confronts with deadly hostility the new values of the awakening race soul. At the head of this stands a host of mestizo "artists." Barbusse, Sinclair, Unamuno, Ibanez, Maurois, Shaw and their publishers worked in the closest collaboration with Mann, Kaiser Fulda and their newspaper clique. They ensure praise, translation and performances for each other. The entire world press publicizes three months in advance the great revelation that Thomas Mann is writing a new novel. Each reports through the mouth of the other how Thomas Mann rests, how he thinks and how he works—whether in closed room or in the open air, whether in the morning or the evening. This resolute, contemporary philistinism decays in its living body in spite of all the hymn singers in the media of Jewish advertising. It murmurs about mankind and about peace between the peoples, and about justice. But it has not an ounce of true full-blooded humanity to impart. It has made peace with the powers which regarded the World War as *their* business. It writes in newspapers which mock the true right of a nation to the intrinsic expression of its essence. Stagnant like political democracy itself are its psalmists—George Bernard Shaw and his clique and others—who, year by year, only suck out our life substance. Despite their failures to develop a culture or a value they kick their opponents like a donkey.

There is some possible excuse for the failures of the 19th century—the fact that its men stood in the midst of a rushing torrent of awakening industrialism.They, like many others in other times, were overwhelmed by what is new. They felt the old values tremble, but who could censure them if they saw no sunrise—but perished? But the 20th century revealed men who were arrogant enough to appear as prophets of a new system. Today, we see that everything which they preached was bloated carrion in whose strength they did not themselves believe. Ibsen and Strinberg struggled honorably until their death. The last contemporary prophets of

Democracy and Marxism have no belief in others and they carry no personal values within themselves. They now root around in Chinese, Greek and Indian literature for forms. Witness the world of Klabund, Hoffmansthal, Hansenclever, Reinhardt! Such writers merely polish and copy the literature of blacks from Timbuctoo. They then set before their public a "new beauty" and a new rhythm of life.

That is the essence of the intellectuality of today, the modern drama, the modern theatre, modern music! A stink of corpses emanates from Paris, Vienna, Moscow and New York. The parasitic Jew mingles with the scum of all peoples. Bastards are the "heroes" of the times. Whores and naked dance reviews under black management were the art form of the November democracy. The end, the total plague of the soul seemed imminent.

The millionfold host of workers in mines and those before the flames of the blast furnaces were enslaved and robbed. They experienced want and suffered from all the terrors of an obtrusive new machine rulership. Yet they would not surrender. They fought. They sought for a leader figure, but found none. It is shattering to have to admit that, at the head, were grime-covered but powerful figures led by—as long as it was not dangerous—Jewish lawyers and traitors who were financed by large banks. The "worker poets" were unable to give birth to one genuine fighter. No knight was found in the struggling army of workers neither in life nor in art.

Bebel remained a little sergeant his whole life long. Hauptmann did not progress beyond *Die Weber* and *Kollegen Crampton*. In this fact alone we find the proof that Marxism was not a real German, not a real Western, movement of freedom, for a movement true to its racial type creates its heroic figures as its supreme value. But in place of a Nordic racial literature came a cowardly rabble of Marxist 'leaders' who allowed themselves to be bought by anyone who had the money. In place of a totality, class stepped forward as a Jewish value. The German worker forgot that one may not betray *Volk* and Fatherland but must conquer, but under Jewish leadership he destroyed both.

The new awakening workers' movement—National Socialism—will need to prove that it is in a position to present the German worker and the entire people not only with a workable political idea but also with an ideal of the beauty of masculine strength and will. Our supreme spiritual value will prevail over all others. We will create the prerequisite for an organic art which produces life.

In all towns and cities of Germany we can already see the potential of acceptance of our ideas. The faces which gaze forth from the war memorials, from under their steel helmets, have everywhere a similarity which can only be described as mystical: a steep furrowed brow, a strong straight nose with angular frame, a firmly closed mouth with the deep fissures of a tensioned will. The widely spread eyes look straight ahead, as into the distance, and into eternity. The willed manliness of the front soldier is distinguished from the ideal of beauty of earlier times. The inner strength has become clearer than it was at the time of the Renaissance or during the Baroque period. This new beauty is also a racially-intrinsic image of the beauty of the German worker, of the present-day struggling Germans as a whole. But in order to prevent this life-giving allegory from arising, conquering morphium-sick bastards in Jewish "workers" newspapers and periodicals paint us with crippled and distorted faces. They fashion woodcuts in which idiocy and epiliepsy are supposed to represent will. Meanwhile, the churches helplessly order more "crucifixions" or "Lambs of God."

But nothing is of avail; the betrayal of 1918 has begun to avenge itself on the traitors. By looking at death in battles; out of the struggle, wretchedness and misery, a new generation strives upward. This generation sees before its eyes an old yet new ideal of beauty that is true-to-type, a beauty which is animated by a true-to-type creative will. The future belongs to us.

Behind the old aesthetic values, a new "extra-aesthetic" value system arises. The personality conditions the man and his aesthetics and these enhance one another. A true personality always interacts with the racial supreme value. For example, a slave is given a certain life form by his personality which has accepted unconditional subjection. The superior man has a superior personality and these interact. A bastard screams his obscenities and these are part of, and interact with, his personality.

In the midst of the collapse of 1918 the new generation of Germany sought a new art, but with the knowledge that such could not be born until a new supreme value could be established over the whole of life—until it shall have taken possession of us. It is no accident that the World War has not yet found its poets. However emotionally stirring individual songs may be, Volk and Fatherland as values both suddenly appeared among us. Only in the midst of battles was the German myth awakened. Those who experienced it most strongly are covered by the sod or the billowing waves of the sea. The others fell into the mire of the collapse. The majority lost their faith in fighting at all for anything that was of value.

Today, however what is universal-personal comes from the individual. The need of the times engraves it onto the heart of every German. Even the smallest sacrifice in the World War signified sacrifice for 80 million Germans. These 80 million alone—through the community of the sacrifices made for them—belong together forever along with their children and their descendents. The abstract enthusiasm before the war for the "fatherland" is today, in spite of all earlier parliaments, a real mystic experience. This experience will, and must, be enhanced by a self-evident feeling of reality. Moreover, this feeling signifies that the atoms of the peoples, the individual souls, have gradually begun to adjust themselves toward identity of mind. Personalities who further this with all their strength, year by year, will then by natural necessity be pushed to the fore. And whatever shape political life may continue to take, the hour of the birth of the poet of the World War has come! He knows with all others that the two million dead German heroes are the real living, that they gave their lives for nothing other than the honor and freedom of the German people, that in this deed lies the sole source of our spiritual rebirth, and that this is the sole value under which all Germans can live without contradiction. This German poet will then, with a strong hand, drive out the worms from our theatres; he will make fruitful the musicians with a new heroic music, and guide the chisel of the sculptor. The heroic memorials and memorial groves will be shaped through a new generation to create places of pilgrimage to a new religion, where German hearts can be formed anew again and again in the sense of a new mythos. Then, the world will be born again through art.

Book Three
THE COMING REICH

In the entire life history of a people,
its holiest moment is when it awakens
from its powerlessness. . . a people
which, with joy and love, grasps the
eternity of its nationhood can, at all
times, celebrate its festival
of rebirth and its day of resurrection.

—Friedrich Ludwig Jahn

I. Mythos and Type

THE time will one day come when people will honor their great dreamers for being decisive men of action. The dreamers developed an image and out of these visions a goal of life was created. While they walked among us as men of science and religion and as philosophers and statesmen they made the decisions and fabricated the ideas, in various media and in many ways, which ideas shaped our world. The dream of an inventory is the first expression of a spiritual strength. It directs all inner motion in one direction—in the torment of recognition that the inward vision cannot be completely realized. It enhances all spiritual and intellectual energies and finally, gives birth to the creative act around the axis of which a new era rotates like the rotation of the earth on its axis.

Once the Nordic spirit dreamed its dreams on the Mediterranean sea and in Hellas; dreamed of the nearness of the sun and the flight of men far beyond Olympus. This longing created the drama of Icarus. That spirit died like Icarus, but one day it would revive to pulsate in another place. Sun maidens and sword maidens were sent through the air by dreaming man who, in storm and all weather, saw the Valkyries hunt above him and then he himself soared up into the infinitely remote Valhalla. The age-old longing became image in Wieland the Smith and it died once more in order to reawaken to a new life in Leonardo's workroom. From the

imagery of the poet came a practical transforming will. A strong humanity had seized nature and, with a masterful searching gaze, learned her laws by quietly listening. But it was nevertheless always too early. Four hundred years later those who dreamed of human flight mastered the brittle material. Matter was this time constrained, concentrated purposefully to harnessed energy, the driving motive was found. One day a silver airship flew glittering through the air rapidly and controlled as a realized drama of many millennia.

The forms of realization were other than as the first dreamers had conceived them, which was a mere technicality and remained temporarily bound. But the spiritual-masterful impetus was the eternal, inexplicable goal-setting will overcoming earthly gravity.

Once men dreamed of an all-seeing and all-hearing Being. They called it Zeus. It gazed from the clouds of Olympus over the land, or perhaps, as Argus. Only a few were bold enough to demand the same for men. But these few dreamers investigated the essence of the lightning throwing god and examined the mysteriously unleashed natural forces. One day with the aid of these forces they spoke far apart with one another, linked only by a wire. Then even this wire was no longer necessary. Tall slender towers today send mysterious waves out into the entire world and these discharge themselves thousands of miles away as song or music. A bold dream again became life and reality.

In the midst of a desert, warriors and conquerors once dreamed of a paradise. This dream of a few was transformed into the labor of millions. From one stream to another trickling water passed through ditches, in well planned lines through the arid desert. As if altered by magical powers, the yellow sand turned green and grain fields rustled, pregnant with heavy fruit. Towns and cities arose, art and science flowered until over this "Paradise" conjured up by a dreaming human race, dreamless conquerors passed, destroying everything. They consumed the fruits of the land but did not understand the living dream. The canals silted up, the water turned stagnant and ran back into its original river bed from where it streamed back into the shapeless Indian Ocean. The forests were crippled, the wheat fields vanished; in place of the grass there reappeared stone and drifting sand. Men perished or moved on, the cities sank back into the sand, the dust settled over them. Thousands of years later Nordic dreamers dug up the petrified culture from rubble and ashes. Today, the entire picture of the former paradise stands before our eyes as a spent dream which had once produced life, beauty and strength as long

as a superior race ruled. It will live again and it will dream again. But as soon as races of a dreamless kind took over and attempted to realize the dream, reality vanished with the dream.

Just as in the land of the two rivers there was a dream of a fruitfulness and power, so a great generation in Hellas dreamed of beauty and life-creating Eros. In India and on the Nile men dreamed of discipline and holiness. Germanic men dreamed of the paradise of honor and duty.

Alongside the prophetic dreams there are also destructive dreams. They are just as real and often just as strong as the creative ones. Tales are still heard even today of the small dark peoples in India whose piercing gaze charms snakes and birds, forcing them into the nets of huntsmen. We know of the monstrously strong evil dream of Ignatius Loyola whose soul-destroying breath lies even today over our entire culture. We also know the dream of the black dwarf Alberich who cursed love for the sake of world domination. On Mount Zion a dream was cultivated for centuries, the dream of gold, of power, of lies and hatred. This dream drove the Jews around the entire world, a restless, strong dream. Here it creates reality, there it destroys reality. It is the bearer of evil lives and weaver of visions even today among us. The Jew's dream, experienced for the first time in all its power three thousand years ago, almost became reality after many aborted attempts in which he misused God and dreamed of world domination. Abandoning love, beauty, honor, the Jew dreamed only of the loveless, the ugly and the honorless. The Jew sought domination and, untill 1933, seemed stronger than us. Because we had ceased to search for our dream, and because we had lost our dream, we had even attempted to experience the dream of the Jews. This also caused the German collapse of 1918.

The greatest and most blessed thing in the German life is the mythical, senstive, yet strong, awakening. The fact is that we have again begun to dream our own primal dreams—not with willed intent but far more spontaneously—in many places simultaneously—all in the same direction. It is again the old, yet new, dream of Meister Eckehart, of Frederick the Great and of Lagarde.

Once, Nordic vikings sailed into the world. True, they robbed like all other warriors, but they dreamed of honor and state, of ruling and creating. Everywhere they came, images of their individual culture rose; in Kiev, in Palermo, in Brittany, in England. Where an essence alien to their race and dream appeared, the dreamed realities broke; where similar type dreamers lived, a new culture was born.

The dream of an honorable Reich made the ancient German emperors take to the sword against the knights who revolted against them. This dream drove them to distant Rome, to the endless Orient. Their blood trickled away among the ruins of Italy and at the "Holy Sepulcher." Despite this blood-letting they did not experience their dream. The old dream became alive again on Markish sand. But it subsequently declined again and seemed lost and forgotten. Today we have at last begun to dream again.

A seer in the midst of revelry during the second *Kaiserreich* laid down the Germanic Nordic-Western dream. Almost singlehandedly he created racially-inherent goals. In his *Deutsch Schriften* and in various passages from his other great works he wrote:

> "There has never been a truly German state. The present day state is a hollow shell. Our political life is a farce. Public opinion a cowardly whore. . .That the German Reich is incapable of life, is now clear to every eye. . .We live in the midst of a civil war which provisionally takes its course without direction. Our substitute for the racial state is conducted with the greatest vulgarity by silence and slander. . .We are ill from the necessity of having to do in 1878 what we should have done in 878. . .The belief in immortality becomes more and more a condition for us under which we can alone maintain life in a Jewish-German state which is mistakenly fabricated out of clay and iron. The religious concept of Christianity is false. True religion is the personal relationship to God. True worship is the unconditional present. . .Paul brought the Old Testament into the church. The truth and the message of the gospels have been overwhelmed. Their doctrine has perished. . .That a national religion is necessary to every nation is revealed by the following considerations. Nations originate not by physical breeding, but by undergoing common historical events. They are subjected to the rule of providence. Therefore, true nations are of divine appointment. They are created. . .to recognize ever anew God's mission. In doing God's will his nation may dip into the well which gives eternal youth. To always serve him in our assigned mission means to acquire higher purposes, and with them, a higher life. . .World religion in the singular and national religions in the plural—these are the beginning points of two diametrically opposed camps. . .Nations are ideas of God! Catholicism, Protestantism, Jewry and Naturalism must be cleared from the field before beginning a new world outlook, so that they are no longer thought of, just as the night lamp is no longer thought of when the morning sun shines over the mountains. The unity of Germany becomes more questionable day by day. There is only one guilt for man, that of not being himself. The great future which I announce and demand, lies still far before us. . ."

It is not such a long time since this great German dreamer passed from us: Paul de Lagarde died on December 22, 1891. After Meister Eckehart he was perhaps the first who had given verbal expression to the eternal German dream. He was without those ties which still enchained the greater earlier teacher, Eckehart. What motivated German knights thousands of years ago, drove them up to the heights but also into error and guilt, became brilliant consciousness here for the first time. Today the German people begins to dream Eckehart's and Legarde's dreams again. But many still have not the courage for this dream. Alien dream visions still often hinder their spiritual effectiveness. For this reason, a modest attempt is undertaken here to lay down what in the two preceding books was represented more analytically as our essence, as an image, insofar as this is permeated by the eternal Nordic-Germanic ideas, not in technical details. And where this must be outlined, it is done with the awareness that they could take a completely different appearance if new means of mastery over the earth are found. The flight of Icarus differed from the building of the zeppelins in nearly everything. However, the will which gave a direction to this effort was a similar one. Moreover, a determined will, grounded on a clear order of rank of values, coupled with organic strength of outlook, will also one day—despite all hindrances—enforce its realization in all domains.

* * *

The values of character, the lines of spiritual life, the colorfulness of symbols run alongside each other, entwine with each other and result in a man. But only when in complete full-blooded abundance, when they themselves are consequences, is that which emanates from one center—that which lies beyond the empirical—born. This incomprehensible synthesis of the individual consciousness of the peoples, of a community as a whole, forms its mythos. Homer's world of the Gods was such a mythos, which protected Greece and maintained it even when alien men and their values began to gain power over Hellenic life. The myth of the beauty of Apollo; and the strength of Zeus; of necessity and destiny in the Cosmos; and the human essence mysteriously linked with it. All these things constitued what was Greek influence over thousands of years. Although it only gathered around type-breeding strength with Homer.

However, not only a creative dream vision unfolds such enormous strength. It unfolded as well in the vast and destructive strength which

emanated from the Jewish parasitical dream of world domination. For over three thousand years he has carried forward the black magic of politics and trade. The current of this impulsive power to acquire gold often arose "forsaking love." The children of Jacob operated the golden nets that enchained the great hearted, the tolerantly thinking or the weakened peoples. In Mephistopheles we find such a figure of corrupted power. It is found today in the laws that direct the lords of the grain and diamond exchanges, the "World press" and the League of Nations. The strength of Nordic spiritual flight has been crippled. The earthen-heavy creature of Ahasverasus sucks at the lamed muscles. Where any kind of wound is torn open in the body of a nation, the Jewish demon always eats itself into the infected part and, as a parasite, it exploits the weak hours of the great nations of this world. His mentality is not to fight as a hero for enlightened, constructive rule, but to make the world "liable to financial interest." This is the direction of this dream-strong parasite—not to fight but to creep; not to serve values, but to devaluate—these things constitute his law according to which he has moved and from which he can never escape as long as he exists.

In this great, perhaps final, conflict between two souls that are worlds apart, that is where we stand today. This conflict of the German genius with the Jewish demon has been unwillingly described by a half-Jew in its essential features. He writes: (Arno Schickedanz: *Sozialparasitismus im Volkerleben*)

> "The evil demon of Jewry is. . .Phariseeism. It is certainly the bearer of the hope of the Messiah, but simultaneously is the guardian which prevents any Messiah from arriving. . .That is the specific, most dangerous form of Jewish denial of the world. . .The Pharisee actively denies the world. He ensures that, where possible, nothing takes shape and, in so doing, he is driven by a demonic emotion. This apparent denial is thus actually a particularly violent kind of world-affirmation, but with negative symptoms. The Buddhist would be happy if around him the world fell asleep. The Pharisee would be finished if around him life did not wish to take on shape again and again, for then his life-function of denial would no longer find a use. . .They are the spirit which always denies and with an ecstatic affirmation of a Utopian existence which can never be, conceal the arrival of the Messiah. They would have to hang themselves like Judas, if the latter really came, since they are completely incapable of yea-saying."

If one wishes to probe thoroughly into the depths of these admissions and similar confidences which frequently suddenly appear, then everywhere the same result is revealed: Parasitism. In this context the concept

will not be grasped as a moral evaluation but as the characterization of a biological fact, in exactly the same way as we speak of parasitical phenomena in the plant and animal world. The sack crab bores through the posterior of the pocket crab, gradually growing into the latter, sucking out its last life-strength. This is an identical process to that in which the Jew penetrates into society through the open wounds in the body of the people, feeding off their racial and creative strength until their decline. In fact, this destructiveness is that "active denial of the world" of which Schmitz speaks, the "concern" at the fact that "nothing takes shape." The Jew—the Pharisee, the parasite—himself possesses no talent for indigenous growth, no organic shape of the soul and therefore no racial shape. Heretofore only one researcher has alluded to this extraordinarily important point which, according to strictly scientific proof concerning the biological laws operative with the Jewish parasite, finds its closest explanation in that the outward diversity of Jewry does not stand in contradiction to its inner unity but—however remarkable this may sound—as its condition. Schickedanz stressed the very opposite notion in his description of the Jewish anti-race. Its parasitic life activity likewise is manifested in a certain blood selection, remaining always the same, always the opposite of the constructive labor of the Nordic race. Conversely, wherever in the world parasitic cells formed, these have always felt themselves drawn to Jewry. This was exactly the case when the scum of Egypt left the land of the pharaohs along with the Hebrews.

It corresponds to this parasitical devaluation of creative life that the parasite also has his "mythos." In the case of Jewry this driving force is like the delusions of grandeur by an insane man. This is the mythos of *The Chosen.* It sounds like mockery that a God could have chosen this anti-nation—whose description Wilhelm Busch and Schopenhauer have already exhaustively provided—as his favorite. However, since the image of God is formed by man, so it is naturally understandable that this "God" has sought out this "People" among all others. In this respect it was only good for the Jews that their creative incapacity prevented them from also representing this "God" bodily. Otherwise, the outcry of horror among all Europeans would then certainly have prevented the taking over of Jehovah and his ennoblement by poets and painters from the start.

With these words the most important things about Jewry have been said. From the demon of eternal denial springs the uninterrupted gnawing away at all expressions of the Nordic soul; that inner impossibility to say yes to the greatness of Europe; that everlasting combating

of a real cultural form in the service of shapeless anarchism which is only scantily cloaked by "prophecies" devoid of essence.

Jewish parasitism as a concentrated enormity is thus derived from the Jewish mythos, the domination of the world agreed to by the God Yahveh for the racial cultivation of Ezras. The Talmud of the rabbis has created a common outlook and a blood of unbelievable tenacity. The character of the Jews in their intermediary activity and decomposition of the alien types has remained always constant from Joseph in Egypt to Rothschild and Rathenau; from Philo by way of David ben Solomon up to Heine. Until 1800 the unscrupulous moral code had first place for the training and breeding of the Jewish type. Without the Talmud and Schulchan Aruch, Jewry is not conceivable as a totality. After a short epoch, when the Jews also appeared "emanicpated" at the end of the 19th century, the anti-racial idea has stepped into the foreground as fully justified and has made its stamp in the Zionist movement. The Zionists declare interest in the Orient yet energetically safeguard themselves against going to Palestine as pioneers of Europe. A leading writer even openly said that the Zionists would "Fight alongside in the ranks of the wakening Asiatic peoples." From the fire of all burning thornbushes and from the nights of solitude only one cry resounds to them: Asia. Zionism, it is asserted, is only a partial idea of Pan-Asiaticism. At the same time a spiritual and political link passes over to the idea of Red Bolshevism. The Zionist, Holitscher, discovered the inner parallels between Moscow and Zion while the Zionist, F. Kohn, declared that—from the patriarchs—a single line extends up to Karl Marx, Rosa Luxemburg and to all Jewish Bolshevists who have served the "cause of freedom."

This Zionism proclaims its wish to found a "Jewish State." A desire may quite honorably exist among a few leaders for some final redemption to build a pyramid of life on the soil of the "Jewish nation." Building such a state results in a vertical structure in deference and contrast to the horizontal layering of former existence. Regarded from the primordial aspect, this Jewish infection is alien to our national feeling and the ideas of State of the European peoples. An attempt to really form an organic community of Jewish farmers, workers, craftsmen, technicians, philosophers, soldiers and statesmen, contradicts the instincts of this anti-race. Such an idea is condemned to collapse from the start. If the Jews were really let loose among themselves they would produce no culture. Orthodox Jews represent the real Jewish essence. They absolutely reject those parts of Zionism that imitate western philosophies of life. They lay claim to a "world mission," fighting consciously against the attempt to make

out of Israel a nation like any other. Such a thought is dismissed as representing a decline. This logical conduct is regarded as an insight by many Zionists. Their own movement is already regarded in a completely different way than in its first period. Theodor Herzl created orthodox Zionism as a protest against the universal European Zionist Congress in August 1929 in Zurich. A leading Zionist, Martin Buber, established the various viewpoints. There are three fundamental outlooks of the Jewish nation: one says that Israel is less than a nation; the second places Israel on the side of the modern nations; and the third, which is also the view of Buber, reveals Israel as a whole nation which is superior to other nations. In this connection, the authority on Zionist orthodoxy *Der Israelit* remarked: "This is, in fact, what we have been saying day in, year out, and upon which our position of rejection of modern Zionism is based: that it does not place Israel above the nations." If the Zionist ideology were fertilized by the ideas of the chosen of Israel—to march with prophetic mission at the head of the peoples—then Buber, the successful mediator of Biblical word and idea, understands the super-national task of Israel. He must have learned this from the prophets. We are moved by these words, thus understood to be the central points in our program. They are the center of Zionist thought and activity. We would have reason to fight in Zionism a contradictory idea. The Jewish nation, its world hope and world task, are summed up in this idea.

This "world hope" of the "chosen" consists in living off all the nations as a sucking parasite. It consists in allowing Jerusalem to take shape only as an occasional center of counsel from which instincts which are thousands of years old could be strengthened and enlarged through rational planning. Zionism would then be not a state-political movement—as some incorrigable European enthusiasts imagine—but an essential movement for the strengthening, particularly, of the horizontal parasiticism of the intellectual and material commission business. The enthusiasm of the Zionist Holitscher for the Russian racial chaos is therefore just as characteristic as the investigation of the Zionist Buber, the pro-Asiaticism of the Zionist Hoflich, the united realization of Father Jacob and Rosa Luxembourg, as seen today through the Zionist Fritz Kohn.

The ancient mythos of the chosen people bred a new type of parasiticism with the aid of modern technology and the one-world civilization idea of a world grown soulless.

* * *

The power of the Roman church rests on the Catholic belief of the representation of God through the Pope. All the actions, doctrines and principles of the Vatican and its servants reinforce this mythos. The myth of the representation of God could recognize no race or nation as a supreme value. Its doctrines of love and humility produced adherents who had to believe as doctrine the Pope's claim that he represented God. In return for this subjection, eternal blessedness is promised. In the essence of the Roman-Syrian-Jewish-Alpine mythos there lies the denial of personality as the supreme value of the race but also as a result we have the doctrine of universalism, not race, taught to the people. Race, people, and personality were reduced to a means which must serve the representative of God and his world power. Rome, therefore, necessarily does not know any organic spatial politics but only one center: The Diaspora as community of the faithful. The Pope, conscious of his duty toward the mythos, can therefore develop guidelines to strengthen, alternately, the Diaspora through the center and the standing of the center through successes in the Diaspora.

As a world state of faithful souls, Rome is without state territory and commands power only through a symbol of right to earthly rulership. It is thus freed from all stirrings of will connected with space, blood and soil. Just as the real Jew only sees the "pure" and "impure," the Mohammedans only the faithful and unfaithful, so Rome sees only Catholics—whom it exclusively equates with Christians—and non-Catholics who are called "pagans." So, in the service of its mythos, the Vatician has to condemn all religious national and class struggles as well as dynastic and economic disputes. It judges disputes purely from the standpoint of whether they bring about the destruction of a non-Catholic religion, nation and class and whether they promise an increase in the total number of Catholics—irrespective of race. Whites, blacks and yellows are all welcomed.

It has to fill the faithful with the will to do battle. Rome has, at times, defended the idea of absolute royalty when this was held to be expedient. When world pressure demanded its abandonment the church declared its support for democracy but only after the idea had conquered monarchy, and only after popular opinion had already come to support it. They were for throne and altar, and for republic and the stock exchange, provided only that these ideas advanced Roman power. They were chauvinistic to the last degree. Rome preached pacifism as true Christianity, if pacifism would advance Rome's attempts to control non-Catholics. In this connection, it is not at all necessary that the tools of the Vatican—Nuncios,

Cardinals, Bishops, etc.—be known liars and swindlers. On the contrary, many have been personally blameless men. But the Vatican, when evaluating various personalities for promotion, concealed the fact that, for example, a Nuncio came to Paris who could declare without opposition and, in accord with the *Institut catholique*, that to fight against Frenchmen meant to fight against God. The passionate Belgian, Mercier, whipped up his Catholic compatriots to resist the Protestant Prussian "Barbarians" while making certain that the high positions in Germany were occupied by pacifists. It happened that, for example, one Jesuit preached hatred and more hatred in the name of Christianity whereas the member of the same order in another country rejected hatred as un-Christian and demanded humility and subjugation.

Many lies may have been spread in individual cases. These actions related to the Roman mythos as the axis of all events. Roman action is quite logical and is removed from sentimental moralizing. For "Christianity" exists just as little as "trade" or "politics" exist as standards of behavior. The one like the other is merely a means to bind souls in a specific way to the mythos of the representative of God on earth. How the current watchwords take their course is a question of expediency. The central mythos determines everything else. Its complete victory would mean that a priest caste would rule over a millionfold host of men which, raceless, willess—as a communistically sectioned community—would regard existence as a gift of God, provided through the all-powerful medicine man in Rome. In the same way, the Jesuits in Paraguay once attempted to rearrange matters there.

Even today, millions, devoid of will and personality, serve this raceless system, without knowing and grasping why. They are bound nationally, spatially and politically to regard any furtherance of their own interests by Rome as genuine good will on the part of the Vatican. Rome expects to receive such expressions of gratitude despite its self-appointed position as guardian of the oppressed, the poor and the downtrodden.

The fact that this Roman policy is often frustrated by other forces, that it often must give way to them outwardly when another supreme value grows greater in souls than the love of Rome, alters nothing in the essence and will of the Vatican as long as the mythos of the representatives of God, and hence, of the claim to power over all souls, exists. Only this central recognition makes comprehensible the policy of the Jesuits, cardinals and prelates over the centuries. The priest type has served well the medicine man mythos in church, art, politics, science and education.

The misfortune which has come over the world today has broken many otherwise upright men. Forced outwardly and inwardly to the ground, millions seek support in types which have become rigid. Rome has used this strife of souls to its advantage. Thus the pre-Aryan stratum, which, owing to Germanic strength, had once slipped out of Roman discipline, is inclined again to the old beliefs. It agreeably joins in preaching the justification of domination by the magician of Rome over our people.

The same Pope who Europe has to thank for the most dishonoring deed of all times, Pius IX, once uttered the words which without doubt are to be regarded as an open exposition of the Roman mythos. On January 18th, 1874—thus on the anniversary of the founding of the German Reich—he declared at an assembly of international pilgrims that Bismarck was the serpent in the paradise of mankind. This serpent seduced Germans into wishing to be more than God himself. Such an over-extension of the human self would be followed by a humiliation such as no people had ever before tasted! Only the Eternal one knew whether or not the "grain of sand on the mountains of eternal retribution" had already been released. This retribution was growing to avalanche proportions and it would rush in a few years at the clay feet of this Reich and transform it into ruins. This Reich, which, like the tower of Babel, had been erected "in defiance of God," would pass away "to the glory of God."

At this "eternal retribution" for the purpose of the "glorification of God" the diplomats dedicated to the Roman mythos worked zealously. They worked as they worked against Karl the Great, Otto I and Ferdinand II. Thus the Center Party in Germany remained completely faithful to itself when it passed over from protection of the throne and the altar to an alliance with the anti-religious Marxists, in the manner Bismarck had already predicted in 1887 when he declared in the Reichstag that the Jesuits would one day be the leaders of social democracy. In the service of "eternal retribution" the Center demanded a "brotherhood in arms" with the Marxists against Protestant Kaiserism. In the days of destiny, 1914, the Vatican spurred on Catholic Austro-Hungry in order to profit from a world war and likewise, to overthrow the Russian heretics as well as the State of the "Serpent in Paradise" (Germany), backed the war effort. In so doing millions of true-believing Catholics had to be sacrificed. As in every great battle plan, this could not be avoided. The Vatican chose to pursue its political ends instead of helping the faithful.

From these and a thousand other examples, one sees both a symbolic and a real cause. The cause was the outlook of Pius IX which came from

the Roman mythos. The new German Reich must be smashed. This was a view which was likewise clearly shared by Benedict XV when he said that he regretted being only a Frenchman in heart. It is again seen in the writings of the little pastor, Dr. Monius, who in disputing the existence of Belgian Franctireurs, joyfully declared that the Catholic section of the people in Germany prevented the formation of a Belgian national state.

Thus it was a matter in furthering the collapse of the German Reich, not only of the Jewish money politics and world-linked parasitical instinct, but also of an old Roman mythic, a Syrian-Hither-Asiatic striving which is inescapably and firmly established. A staggering admission of this was made at the end of 1924 by the Catholic center organ, *Germania*, which read,

> "Whoever wished to seek the fundamental lines in the conduct of the Center Party since 1917(!) must know that this conduct was determined by the actions of prominent Catholics who, in their political intentions and actions, had not fallen away from the fundamental Catholic attitude."

What can be established with complete certainty is that they undermined the true-German consciousness of power. The Center leaders served the raceless Roman mythos against the Evangelical heresy, against the Germanic heresy. Further, Catholicism in Prussia had existed in a completely different environment from, for instance, that of Catholicism in Bavaria. Its work since 1917 could certainly be understood in its depths as an "overcoming of the Brandenburg-Prussian history-psychosis" and as an attempt at a return to the thresholds of Medieval Germany.

Every German should understand these facts so that he comprehends what has happened during the last 1,500 years and what is still occurring before his eyes in the contemporary world. In 1917, the open work of disintegration began through the Reichstag when the Center, Democrats and Marxists, asserted their resolutions of dissatisfaction. In 1917, Erzberger committed his "indiscretion" through which Czernin's letter became known to the Entente. The faithless Emperor Karl, breaking his word, carried on treachery with Poincare. This is described as Catholic policy. If *Germania* asserts another "milieu" for Prussia which also creates a different conduct of Catholic politicians, then, with the first remark, the Nordic environment with conscious national honor is meant. The German Reich of Frederick the Great and Bismarck had to be

"overcome" and, with aid of the allied Jewish money parties, the Protestant North was to be disintegrated. In Bavaria, another milieu, a more Conservative, Volk-preserving, policy consequently had to be pursued since it was necessary here to protect their own denomination. The "policy of unity" of the Center and the federalist policy of its scions in Bavaria served both one and the same goal until the victory of Adolf Hitler: That is, the strengthening of Syrian-Roman centralism.

The classical philosopher of this pseudo-federalism even went so far as to call himself Greater German instead of Greater Roman. The philosopher of this movement and this idea was Constantin Frantz. In his essay *Die Religion des Nationalliberalismus*, Frantz said that the center of European unity should be Germany. It was to lead in political, ecclesiastical and educational areas. Its great aim would be to create universalism by reshaping our educational system. This stands in distinction to our nationalistic system of education which was designed to isolate our contact with universalist systems. The Germanic system was designed to understand power. One could not make Germany into a land like France or Italy. The core and the model of a gradually developing European federation should and must be Germany. That is our destiny. The ean federation should and must be Germany. That is our destiny. The question now arises. Who should determine this destiny? Germany or a foreign master?

Frantz is of the opinion that federalism does not exclude. Rather, it incorporates. It wishes nothing special for itself but always desires all things for all people. It has nothing of the restricted self-satisfaction of nationalism. It is concerned with the whole and with the great. It strives for unity, but only through a free union of the parts established on the basis of intellectual community-building. Thus, instead of centralization, there is far more concentration on a cooperative, independent life cycle in which each component continues to exist in its own right. As a result this system serves the best interests of all.

We have arrived at the fundamental point: The German people is to place itself "federally" into a "totality." And this "totality," for which Germany is to be the means for a concentration of governance, signifies the world policy of the Vatican. In other words, Rome will attempt to sponsor a federalist system which it can use to control all of Europe. We must repeat the point we wish to make. Rome's world policy is served by establishing this European concentration of political power. In other words, the attempt must be made to carry through once again the bloody, unsuccessful experiment of the raceless world church state. We are to

represent the experimental vehicle for this. Its success would throw away everything which was acquired by the blood of our best men in our national culture. Rome would write its interdenominational message on our banner—again in the name of God and of love—and, as a result, assume as a gift the power which we ourselves would have given up.

An article in the *Germania* (in the year 1924) openly spoke of a return to the Middle Ages. Whoever has understood the Bavarian Concordat recently concluded at that time, knows that it signified the first step to extend the successes of the "Great Catholic" Erzberger—so it was said in his funeral address—and to make Bavaria into a springboard for the reconquest of Germany, i.e., as a breeding ground for inter-religious conflicts.

Back to the Middle Ages by revolution! A remarkable solution! Pope Pius XI—loyal to the policy of Pius IX—said on May 23, 1923, in the Consistorium, that German Catholicism "both amidst the fury of the World War as well as under the present developing conditions has applied its zeal, its energetic activity and its organizational skill to restoring and making good the sad falling away from the Roman Church which took place years ago." That is clear enough. The *Bayer Kurier*, the organ of the Bavarian Center, however, openly threatened us all in a manner that makes one wonder how those words could have flown away unheard. It wrote on July 5, 1923:

> "An imminent justice is at work in world history which knows how to punish and to avenge. It has reached the German people, because it will not bend itself to the God-ordained authority. This refusal has, for four centuries, brought every conceivable disaster on the German lands."

It again threatens the German nation with disaster if, at the last hour, it does not learn from history. Thus either the German people will be subjected to the decrees of a foreign power or an "avenging justice" will wipe it off the face of the earth.

The *Augsburg Postzeitung*, a leading South German Catholic paper, wrote in faithful service of the Roman mythos on March 16, 1924, in a polemic against Ludendorff, that the Catholic church:

> "is the sole religious device, nearly the single apparatus upon earth, which has never subordinated itself to the State. . .Therefore its bonds are more holy than those of any nation. Its orders are higher than those of the State. For those who think in the *Volkisch* sense, State or people is the absolute, the highest value and purpose."

Thus here and with pleasing openness, the unbridgeable gulf which lies between German men and the claims to power of an alien mythos is characterized along with its institution. Its center is found outside Germany. We expressly recognized that State and people possess only a subordinate importance for this Center. Simultaneously, with all distinction, the superior justification of church interests over those of State and people are demanded, i.e., the right to commit high treason and betrayal in the name of a higher ideal as compared with one of lower value. The Nordic type is to subject itself to the Roman scheme. The Nordic mythos is to be subject to Roman magic. However, despite this clear assertion, many good German men still do not wish to discuss the powerful interests of the church. However, this problem touches day by day on the life interests of every German. He must decide whether or not he will reject these absurd claims of power by the Roman church. The black Catholic press claims to speak for the Roman church. No one is spared when the black press expressly lays claim to the privilege of insight into Church power politics.

The policy of Pius XI consequently stands unequivocally under the sign of a new Counter-Reformation whipping up all the instincts of the Inquisition—in order to break Germanic Germany forever. Directly, in his enthronement speech, he made the "troubled spirit of the Reformation" responsible for all "rebellions of the last four centuries." Luther destroyed Christian morals—the debauchery of the then Roman church was thus "Christian morality"—and placed himself between soul and God. Such a disturbance in its position of acting as spiritual mediator for all men was something the Roman Church naturally could not bear. In December, 1929, Pope Pius rejoiced at the decay of Protestantism in order to give, a few months later, expression to his official Catholic unwillingness to accept the results of the progress of this Protestantism. He also boldly characterized Protestantism as an "insult to the divine stipendiary of the Catholic Church." In his Christmas message of 1930, the Pope called Protestantism "deceitful, secretive" and "bold and unashamed." On the 16th of March, 1931 he ascended to the apex of hatred when he dared to describe all non-Catholic and Protestant confessions as "outdated heresy." Since the world is dealing here not with some little inciting chaplain but with the supreme head of all Catholics who is accustomed to choosing his words carefully, then all these outbursts signify nothing other than a deliberate and vicious incitement of over a hundred million people with the purpose of furthering and extending his positions of power. He believed he would gain by encircling Protes-

tantism. The true essence of the "Kingdom of Christ" is revealed. The so-called "Catholic Action," of the Volk-disintegrating Pacifist policy of the Center Party, was spread by the Roman Episcopate against German Nationalism by the Roman Episcopate in Germany operating through the declarations of bishops against Nationalism in general. No German Catholic today can shut himself off from the fearful recognition that Roman policy with its clear-sighted aim has formed an alliance with the Marxist subhumans and with other external enemies of Germany in order to complete what was not totally successful in November, 1918. The Roman policy sacrifices—for attainment of this goal—the existence and life of the entire present day generation. This is done in order to force compliance on the impoverished heirs of all Germans under its apostleship. This is the Western Mission which Catholic voices in the Center persist in canonizing. They look for the "restoration of Latinity" with the aid of the coercive threats from France and its allies who are, unfortunately, still hostile to us.

Exactly in this way, the Center press speaks as the leading Christian-Social party in Austria. At the beginning of 1921 the principle of the pure national state was described in the periodical *Das neue Reich* as directly un-Christian. One will have to choose! Thus, the speakers at the German Catholic congresses at Constance in 1923 came to the erudite conclusion that the greatest heresy of today was the "excessive nationalism" which had already caused the "worst devastation and havoc." So spoke the heads of Catholicism—a conclusion which German bishops regurgatate every month.

These admissions—which could be multiplied a thousandfold—are clear and unequivocal. They are shelved, from time to time, since the Center leaders, when it suits their purpose, literally ooze with love of the Fatherland. Occasionally they even are so bold as to declare that the supporting of church power politics was truly German. From this intellectual orientation the blind support of German history results. They ordinarily reject any attempt to create a real German Reich. They never concede the need to create a truly German type for the future under any circumstances.

The so-called *Heilges Romisches Reich Deutscher* Nation, that structure of an inorganic type, for which hundreds of thousands of Germans shed their blood in vain, is today invested with legendary glory. The Middle Ages is represented as a time of peace which resulted from the fact that the Church determined the destiny of the world. We also need to revere the great figures of the German past and be proud of the person-

alities which then ruled Europe. Certainly, we are not proud of them as the representatives of church claims to power. But as the representatives of German blood and the German will to power we do them homage. Heinrich I, who in 925 united the disputing German tribes, rejected annointing by the Pope and made the Rhine into Germany's river. He is regarded by us as the herald of a German Reich. Likewise, Heinrich der Lowe appears as one of the truly great men of our history. Heinrich attempted, with all the strength of a powerful personality, to check the excursions of conquest into Italy. He began the settlement of the East and, as a result, laid a foundation stone for a coming German Reich fostering strong security for the maintenance and protection the German people. This admiration does not prevent us from rejecting the earlier system of the raceless Holy Roman Empire which had to collapse and did so when the other peoples of Europe founded their national states. To wish to live through this destructive mythos again today signifies a crime against the German people. We all struggle to secure a time when these ideas will be regarded as great treachery to the country, as the attempt at the creation of a Bolshevist world republic.

These pronouncements by men bound to the Roman mythos are no accident. They are only a few symptoms among thousands that show the insidiousness of the Roman idea of rule by the church; of love, subjection, slavish obedience and denial of national honor—all in the name of the "Representative of Christ." Alongside demonic Jewry, it is the second alien system which must be overcome spiritually and intellectually if an honor-conscious German people and a real national culture are to arise.

The essence of the present day world revolution lies in an awakening of racial types—not in Europe alone but over the entire earth. This awakening is the organic counter-movement against the last chaotic forerunners of the liberal-economic trading imperialism whose looted victims fell from despair into the Bolshevist net in order to complete what Democracy had begun: the elimination of race and Volk consciousness. The situation of the Roman Reich at the appearance of Christianity was similar to the present day situation in the West. The belief in the old gods had vanished. The Nordic ruling stratum had almost died of disintegration and the will of the state was broken. No type-forming ideal ruled the world. In its place came a thousand enthusiastic teachers from all zones. In the midst of such chaos a "religion of love" could never have triumphed by itself. In fact, it would have led to the wholesale sacrifice of individuals, to uprisings and revolutions. Such were the aims of St. Paul who strove for these as his final goal, when he gave his hypnotizing sermons which were

mainly attended by voluptuous women. It triumphed as form, thanks only to the Jewish will and the fanaticism peculiar to it. Paul transferred this lust to rule, this lust for world domination, to the overthrowing of the state. Today, the old gods are likewise dead. The Oriental belief in the Emperor "by God's grace" has irrevocably vanished. The deification of the state in itself has likewise vanished because it had grown without content into a bloodless schema. Democracy triumphed when the state found itself in a condition of parliamentary decomposition. The rigid churches no longer gave satisfaction to the searchers. An army of sectarians sought inner support with street apostles and tent preachers who "seriously studied" the ancient Jewish Bible in order to prophesy an eternal life here on earth. The raceless idea of Internationalism has thus reached a high point: Bolshevism and world trusts are its symbols. They point to the decline of an era such as, in its hypocrisy and dishonor, the history of Europe has never before seen.

Chaos has today been elevated almost to a conscious program point. As the final consequences of a democratically disintegrated era, the unnatural messengers of anarchy announce their presence in all the great cities of the world. The explosive material is present in Berlin just as in New York, Paris, Shanghai and London. As a natural defense against this world danger, a new experience passes like a mysterious fluid over the globe. This idea places concepts such as *Volk* and race instinctively and consciously into the center of its thinking. It is linked with the organically established supreme values of every nation, around which its feeling evolves, determining the character and the color of the culture from old. What was partly forgotten, partly neglected, is suddenly grasped as its task by millions: to experience a mythos and to create a type. From out of this type we must build our state and life. But now the question is posed as to who is summoned in the midst of an entire people to draw up and found the type-forming architectonics. With this, a problem is touched upon within the race and the Volk: the question of the sexes.

II. The State and the Sexes

We have seen that behind all religious, moral and artistic values a racially conditioned people stand and that, through unhindered race mixing, all true values are ultimately destroyed while the individualities of the peoples vanish in a racial chaos to vegetate away as an uncreative mass or become subservient to a powerful new race will, intellectually and materially subordinated. However, within these world-spanning contrasts of races and souls of life there is another polarization of peoples: the male and the female. If the deepest outward racial and spiritual features, the orientations and structures of values of man and woman in a type-conditioned people are also identical, then nature has created a sexual polarity alongside the other polarities of physical and ideological kinds, in order to produce organic tension and creation, as the preconditions of all creation. This fundamental insight has a twofold result, namely, that certain peculiarities of male and female—although on different planes and within a different typecast—are nevertheless similar according to the simple eternal laws of the physical structural planes of this world and also, that attempts at elimination of the sexually conditioned tensions must necessarily have a diminishing of creative powers as a consequence. This means that sexual collectivism, such as in the case of situations of miscegenation, will end in the debasement of the people. It also means that race mixing debases the offspring as well.

The opinion must be expressed that the recognition of the fact of sexual polarity as alone maintaining creation, producing and releasing tensions, must be an eternally unshakeable conviction because it has been substantiated a thousandfold. In fact, all truly profound thinkers have been of this opinion. These philosophers have a self-evident maturity derived from their conclusions drawn from life. They believe in effect that man is superior to woman in all realms of research, invention, fabrication and creation. The value of woman rests upon the equally important mission of blood preservation and racial propagation.

In times of external catastrophes and inner disintegration, however, feminist man joins with emancipated woman to become the symbol of cultural decline and decay of the state. The speeches by Medea in Euripides' plays are similar to the tirades of Fraulein Stocker of Miss Pankhurst without—in spite of the woman's freedom during the Renaissance, the era of the Sun King, Jacobinism and present day democracy—anything new being revealed other than what Aristotle expressed in a few words: "Woman is woman by virtue of a certain lack of capability." The ancient poets recognized this fact when they symbolized destiny as having been embedded in a cosmic law of female beings; the Teutons by the Norns and the Greeks by the Moirae. This lack of capability is the consequence of a nature directed at the vegetative and the subjective. The woman of all times and races lacks the strength of both intuitive and intellectual vision. Everywhere that a mythic shaping of the world, a great epic or drama or a scientific hypothesis explaining the cosmos, has appeared in world history, a man stands behind them as creator. To the ancient Ayran Indian it is the Prajapati, i.e., the Master of Creatures, who formed this world, or the Purusha, man and spirit who created. The Teutons formed heaven and earth from the giant Ymir and it was the male spirit everywhere which gave birth to a world order against chaos.

Thus everywhere that something typical and type-forming arises, the man is operative as the creative cause. Two of the greatest male acts of all time are called State and marriage.

Present day Feminism—without the author wishing it—has found in Bachofen a glorification of its nature, and many unhealthy thinkers have taken his extravagant fantasies—irrespective of their interesting details—concerning matriarchy as true historical facts. However much he and all those related to him are right to claim hetaerism as a form of government by women, it is nevertheless unjust to assume that state forms of this form ever existed. Bachofen did not shy away from as-

suming the existence of matriarchy in some places simply because women occupied high positions. He then expressed himself poetically about this. For example, he even presumes and asserts this for Sparta on grounds of the freedom enjoyed by women within this rough Dorian tribe. In fact, Sparta offered the example of a well-disciplined state and was devoid of any female influence. The kings and the ephors formed the absolute power, the essence of which was the maintenance and expansion of this power through the increase of the Dorian upper stratum with its disciplined outlook. For that sole purpose, women were also required to participate in gymnastic games. Generally, the wearing of golden jewelry was forbidden to them as were decorative hair styles. If woman enjoyed respect among the Teutons, then it was not because there were matriarchal conditions. On the contrary, it was because partriarchy was completely realized. That system alone provided consistency and, as a result of the racial typification of Nordic man, it was linked with the greatest respect for women. Accompanied by that magnaminity was a part of the eternally searching free nature which, in times of crises, can also become a great danger for the whole, as exemplified in the emancipation of the Jews. When that was approved, the idea of the political emancipation of women was recognized in the state legal domain.

The traditional view is that the family forms the cell of the State. This view has grown into a coercive dogma which, in the fact of Marxist and Democratic attempts to disintegrate all ideas of the family, has constantly been reinforced. This argument not only clouds the stage for the study of the questions of women's rights but it inhibits judgement as a whole as it concerns the nature of the present movement for renewal and of the new State concept of our future.

The State has nowhere been the consequence of a common idea but the result of an alliance of oriented men conscious of their goal and purpose. The family having on occasions proved itself as the stonger, and on other occasions the weaker, supporter of State and Volkish architectonics, has even often been placed in its service conscious of its goal. But nowhere was it the most important pillar of a State, or, in other words, of a community based on political and social power.

The first purposeful association that arose anywhere in the world was the warrior clan, or a tribe, or horde. It was formed for the purpose of creating a common security against a hostile, alien environment. In the subjugation of one tribe by another, the defeated league of warriors was incorporated into the victorious one. Thus the first cell of the purposeful state association arose, existing unconsciously in the idea of a state.

Everything which we describe allegorically about Rome, Sparta, Athens and Potsdam begins with the alliance of warrior men. The bases of the state systems of China, Japan, India, Persia and Egypt also rest upon this primal ground which, under calmer external conditions, received a different kind of character. In its core, however, it always remained an allied league of men, even until the decline of one or the other culture. But decline signified the dissolution of the idea of a male system of training, of a male type-forming norm.

Egypt passed relatively quickly from the league of men warriors into a technical association which for a long time bore the stamp of the learned scribe and the official. It was then pushed aside incrementally by the league of priests. Egypt has therefore aptly been called a state of officials or the "scribes." In each case a completely determined technical norm was recognized as the measuring rod of all action. It has had a type-breeding effect over thousands of years. The first great cultural achievement of the Nile kingdom was making the land arable and utilizing the changes in the soil which resulted from floods. Egypt did not use tribal names. It recognized neither leagues of the sexes nor blood revenge. The family played almost no role at all in the imposing structure of the Egyptian state. This Egyptian concept of the state as controlled by learned officialdom, has persisted tenaciously over thousands of years. However, this type was trained by the purposeful league of Egyptian technicians, the learned ones, the "scribes," who had to give advice concerning regulations of river, land irrigation, atmospheric effects, royal building plans, etc., in order, through the league of priests, to give religious dedication to the entire activity. "See, there is no social rank which could not be ruled, only the scribe who rules himself," are the emphatic words in the Doctrine of Duaf. Thus the learned techician and the correct, but not incorruptible, clerk bred a state community.

We see something similar take place in China. Here, likewise, the league of warriors was transformed into a society of learned men. After Lao-Tse and Confucius had established themselves as classics of the Chinese soul, their teachings on morals and life, in which Confucius completely predominated, became a measure and guiding line for the state life, religion and scientific activity of the Chinese people. For maintenance of the norm, the league of warriors transformed itself into a loosely linked society which found its dominant type in the learned Mandarin. This type ruled the life of China for centuries. There was no high official who had not passed his philosophical examination in the classical teachings of Confucius. This system of training held the Chinese

Empire together during times when the purely political union was weakened through wars and revolutions, that is, the league of men, held together by an openly racially conditioned system, lasted through to the present. With China, the entire ancestral cult, naturally, must be considered. That cult cultivated an instinct of solidarity, of belonging together, at least in family belief. Its earthbound nature provided the most permanent way of cementing together ancient China and it still does so even today. The family, seen from the aspect of the wife's influence, contributed little to nothing to Chinese society and to the nature of the state.

These two somewhat remotely connected examples are also to be found in the kingdoms undoubtedly founded by Aryans. The life style of ancient India was first conditioned by the warrior caste, called the Shatryas. In the ancient songs of the *Veda*, a courageous warlike spirit is breathed forth. It lasted until the time of post-Christian decline. Indeed, even up to the present the Rajputs, the warrior families, were racially an alien Aryan-conditioned body living in disintegrated India. However, gradually the direction of the the people passed over to the Brahmans who finally brought all Indians under their intellectual rule. Secrets and magical rites were the style-forming elements which were so powerfully implanted that, even today, Brahmanism represents the binding force to which hundreds of millions subordinate themselves. In this respect, it is characteristic that the Brahmans—in contrast, for example, to the Roman Popes—have never striven for political power and yet their authority was so great as to introduce the practice of burning of widows. This was permitted by the forgery of an ancient text of the *Veda*. It is a measure which can only be traced back to an authoritarian male society. Nowhere has the power of a compelling, shaping, architectonic idea appeared stronger than in the type of the weaponless, yet ruling, Brahman. The style-forming strength of its philosophy remained praiseworthy despite the fact that there was an unrestricted, wide-spread race-denying doctrine of Universal Oneness that allowed mixing with the aborigines. Thus miscegenation was promoted and dark mixed racial types attained high posts.

Another, clearly evident example which proves that men were germ cells of the state and backbone of a life type is offered us by Hellas in its political systems known by the names Sparta and Athens. One merely repeats elemental wisdom if he pauses to describe the power of the league of warriors over Spartan life. In Athens, it was not fundamentally different. When later, within men of more insight, the recognition of disintegration occurred during democratization one could always fall back on and rely on the male leagues. The members of these associations did

not describe themselves as members of a family and clan, but described themselves as "brothers." In Greek life they represented a completely conscious retreat from the bonds of relationships based upon feelings. In Athens the league of youth, the *Ephebia*, took first place. It is no accident if Aristotle begins the representation of the Constitution of Athens by mentioning this state youth league. This control by the state signified the attempt, carried out shortly before him by the disintegrating individualistic democracy, to re-establish the original and ancient Greek league of men warriors. In our understanding it signifies nothing other than the introduction of a universal military service for all young, free Athenians. In their 18th year they were put into barracks and identically uniformed. Gymnastic masters and educators strictly watched over the maintenance of discipline, guaranteeing strength and uniformity. This act of despair by the Greek democracy knowing that the aristocratic Athenian had once arisen from among them, came too late. Athens' strength decomposed through the subversion by demagogues, sophists, democrats, and women emancipated from femininity and by race mixing. These things had to bow to a powerful new league of men, the warriors of Alexander the Great. If one looks even deeper, then he will also have to take into consideration the Athenian artist's guilds, the philosophers' schools and as a male league, one also must not overlook the great role played by the oracle goddesses in Greek life. The latter particularly represent the non-type-forming side of pre-Greek life with its emphasis upon superstition. These and the Dionysus cult are also unquestionably closely connected racially with the subordinated native stratum. The same is true of the later Bacchus cult which grew into a symbol of the late Greek era. Bacchic festivals, hetairai economy and democratic slave emancipation were the disintegrating powers which mitigated against the Greek Volkhood, the Athenian state and the Hellenic culture in general.

We can observe a very interesting relationship among state, people, league of men, and family in Rome. The individual in Rome almost ceased to be a personality. His entire service and his whole life belonged to the community. The consciousness of the power and greatness of this community, however, represented in its after-effect the pride, indeed, the personal property, of the citizen. If, from the aspect of the state, he was only a number, then individualism was legally unrestricted. Here the "family" also took its place. It has unquestionably been an enormously important stone in the building of the Roman state. But, as is known, this "family" was nothing other than a tool of the *Pater Familias* which disposed permanently over life and limb of all its members. Thus here

also, merciless male discipline ruled. The grown-up son could only withdraw from the tyranny of the head of the family by entry into the league of men, the *Curia*, the army. These forces mutually balanced each other, watched over the discipline of state citizens and created that rigid Roman type which conquered the world. Its laws still determine the norm of Western life even today. It must be said here at once that the crassly individualistic, private-capitalistic Roman law created Roman strength but—released from its environment of intrinsic type—had a disintegrating effect on the Germanic essence. It must again be eliminated if we wish to recover our health.

The principles of collapsing Rome were taken over by a new league of men aiming at world rulership: the Catholic church. Christianity entered into world history, carried by a great personality. At first it was only emotional movement. Later, it infiltrated the state as a raceless mass movement. but when it had conquered the state the priests began, exactly as in Egypt and India, to control the architecture of thought, to represent themselves as the sole justified mediators between man and God and to 'improve' history according to its needs. This previously described system has proven to be an enormous disciplining power. It was shaped completely by an extremist league of men whose representatives practiced celibacy. Women were, and still are, regarded up to today, only as serving elements. Through the introduction of the Isis-Mary cult, account was also taken of the female maternal feeling. Through this concession to the emotional side—beginning with tolerant dedication and ending in religious hysteria, paired with complete exclusion of the female element from the structure of the church—the Roman church system of the league of men has based its capacity for resistance. In this respect, however, it must not be forgotten that the types of the Brahman and the Mandarin are even far older and stronger than the type of the Roman priest.

It is evident that the leaders of the male leagues have everywhere striven to prove that their rulership was willed by God. The Egyptian Pharoah did this just as did the Brahman who boldly declared of whoever knew the secrets of the *Veda* and mastered the sacrificial ceremony that "the Gods are in his hand."

The idea of divine grace was then taken over in the West by a male league completely different from the Roman priesthood; by the Germanic Knights Order which reached its peak under the Kaisers. The Middle Ages signifies the tortured attempt to "equilibrate monks and knights"—these two great types of the league of men—to one another, whereby each one made efforts to be serviceable to the other.

In its essence, the Roman system was not Nordic and the Knights Order of the Middle Ages was only one side of the struggle for release from it. The Germanic orders and guilds, the city leagues, the Hansa, etc., appear as forces which made themselves free of the Roman ideas. Protestantism, as an anti-Roman orientation of feeling, therefore corresponded to a disposition spread over the whole of Europe. It was, as even Gorres admitted, the ethical conscience of Germanic man. However, the Reformation carried no type-forming strength within it. Rather, it merely prepared the ground for the national ideas which have only begun to unfold their mythic strength in our times. The Roman system of training could only be pushed aside by another type-breeding power. This was developed, at first, in the type of the Prussian officer, who, as was proved in 1914, became the type of the German soldier. The Prussian, then the German, army was one of the most splendid examples of the architectonic league of men corresponding to that of the Nordic, for it was built on honor and duty. Therefore, by necessity, it bore a hatred of others.

These observations can be extended at length by choice. The German order of Knights of the Sword, the Templars, the Freemasons league, the Jesuit Order, the association of Rabbis, the English Club, the German student corporations, the German Freikorps after 1918, the S.A. of the NSDAP—these are all eloquent examples of the insurmountable fact that a state, volkish, social or church type, however different their forms may be, go back almost exclusively to a league of men and its training. The woman and the family are added on or excluded. The woman's capacity for sacrifice forces her into the service of a type. Only the power of another idea releases her from the system of training. Such an idea may use her as an element of disintegration—as in Hellenic democracy, as in late raceless Rome, as in the present day movement of "Emancipation"—or, in order to make their power of passionate dedication serviceable to a new type-forming ideal after a revolutionary transition.

* * *

The demand for equal political rights for women was the natural consequence of the ideas of the French revolution. These rights were promoted by liberal, so-called human rights, philosophies. The emancipation of the Jews followed from the preaching of the insane idea of human equality. So also was the case with the "liberation" of woman from male "slavery." The demand for present day female emancipation was raised in the name of boundless individualism, not in the name of a

new synthesis. In the sense of "living to the full" the movement was then interpreted accordingly by its adherents. As a reinforcement of this demand came the shaping of the social situation through world trade and over-industrialization. Women were forced to assist their men in the factories in order to maintain the life of the family. The entry of women into the work force lowered the man's wages. As a result, the period of bachelorhood was unnaturally lengthened. This increased the number of unmarried marriageable women. In turn, this led to the increase of prostitution.

Here, one of its most important tasks awaited the state. However, the state was not equal to the task. It could not cope with industrialization and proletarianization. Possibly, the domocratic state never could be equal to this task. The workers movements were completely justified. They saw in woman a fellow sufferer and made her cause likewise a program point of their efforts.

In 1905, the "League for the right of women to vote," founded in 1902, announced the following demands:

> Admission of women to all responsible community and State posts; admission of women to the practice of law; communal and political voting rights, etc.

This was the program, a deliberate reaching out for control of the State.

If we recall the facts represented at the outset, that in the entire course of world history, State, social architectonics, every lasting combination has been the consequence of the male will and masculine creative power, then it is clear that to concede a fundamental permanent influence of women in the State, must be to represent the beginning of evident decay. In this connection it is not a question of good will or "positive co-operation," nor of one or another competent—even great—female personality, but of the essence of woman, which, in the last analysis, approaches all questions lyrically or intellectually, never viewing things as a whole. Our feminist-democratic "Humanity" which is so sympathetic to the individual criminal but forgets the State, the people—in brief—the type, is thus really the breeding ground for all efforts which deny norms or only participate in them emotionally.

It is characteristic of the nature of the protagonists of a "women's state" that their attack—in harmony with the entire Marxist and Democratic Jewish press—is directed instinctively against "Prussian Militarism," i.e., against the disciplining and type-creating foundation of our

state. This will be true as long as there are cultures, peoples and states. Thus, for example, England is generally praised because it "does not experience Continental Militarism" (Schirmacher). But up to 1832 the English granted women political, and up to 1835, communal, voting rights in full equality with men. But then, out of very pertinent reasons of experience it abolished these again. These rights were re-introduced in 1929 under the renewed pressures of democracy. The emancipated are not accustomed to speaking well of Germany and its "violations." None of our modern cultural nations is in a position to thank a victorious war fought scarcely a generation ago for its political existence. But every war, every emphasis on the futherance of militarism represents a diminishing of the cultural powers and influence of women. The "emancipated" have no eyes for understanding the fact that every culture for 8,000 years has arisen only under the protection of the sword. All have perished without salvation when the unconditional will to self-assertion was no longer present. Just as the man infected with Marxism sees only his class and his fellow believers, so the emancipated see only the woman—not woman and man, sword and spirit, people and State, power and culture. And just as the mythless and characterless 19th century stood helplessly in the face of Parliamentarism, Marxism and all the other disintegrating forces, so today we experience the fragmentizing femininism of democratic politicians who see themselves thereby as especially liberal.

This "liberality" or rather, the weakness, of the male type-forming power, has encouraged the women's movement to express what the entire thing is directed at: the conquest of power. The exercise of power is sweet. The woman chases after it as much as the man. That female energies seek an outlet when men are tired is a phenomenon of natural necessity.

An entire literature came into being to provide a basis for this general claim to power. It attempted to prove the "absolute equal rank" of women. The fact that women gave birth was put forward with refreshing "logic" as the cause of this "fundamental" equality.

If one alludes to history as the chief witness for the absence of type-forming strength in women, then they complain about the violent repression which has hindered them without noticing that this concession alone is decisive. The greatest male geniuses have often been children of poverty and oppression, but nevertheless they have grown to become rulers and shapers of men. There is more falsehood than truth in the assertion that, historically, women have been oppressed. Even in the gloomy Middle Ages noble women enjoyed a better education than the

knights who rode out to battle and adventure. They also had leisure enough to study anatomy and astronomy at the household hearth. But never from the midst of these women has there emerged a Walther von der Vogelweide or a Wolfram. There was no Roger Bacon who was hunted through all of Europe by the church. No woman became one of the founders of our science. Woman could not create because she lacked the conceptualization which is native only to man. There is no magic or power that permits creativity. It is simply a gift given only to man, never women.

Greece gave intellectual freedom to the hetairae, if not to the wife. Nevertheless, apart from the lyrical-sexual Sappho, nothing noteworthy happened. This freedom of women was far more a clear sign of Hellenic decline. The Renaissance also gave women equal opportunities with men. Women such as Vittoria Colonna, Lucrezia Borgia, are known only to us, not because of their own deeds, but because of the way they were immortalized by men such as Michelangelo. Woman has simply failed to produce or create lasting values of genius.

* * *

The intrusion of the woman's movement into the collapsing world of the 19th century has taken place on a broad front. This female liberation program has, by natural necessity, entered into a mutually reinforcing alliance with all other forces of disintegration—with world trade, democracy, Marxism and Parliamentarianism. The enormous industry of woman in all domains given only a modest display when deeds and victories were counted. There are only a few significant women: Sonya Kowalewsky; Madame Curie, whose genius suddenly vanished when her husband was run over in a street accident; and a legendary inventress of the sewing machine. Otherwise, although there has been a succession of competent women physicians, art and crafts women, female secretaries, scholars and natural scientists, none has produced synthesis.

The "science" of emancipation declares that the so-called female qualities have been merely called forth due to the thousand year old rule by men. When woman ruled, as had occurred at times, "female" qualities were formed in the man. Therefore only sex could be evaluated.

This "logic" is just as typical as it is widespread. Essentially, it springs from the dusty milieu theory, according to which man is nothing other than a product of his environment. This Darwinian "white elephant" must even today bear the burden of providing the "ideological" support

and "scientific" backbone of the champions of women's rights. Two incompatible sequences of thought run alongside one another. On the one side, it belongs to the art of propaganda to call upon male knightliness and sympathy to establish that women have been cheated of their freedom and culture by men. This has led them to demand an alteration in the future.

On the other side, efforts are today made to prove that men generally had "mismanaged" things, that the "century of women" approaches and that in the past there were significant feminist states in which men played the role of obedient house pets. From this we should draw consolation in that the collapse of the male state would not bring chaos in its wake. But, on the contrary, a real culture, and a real human state would commence. It is amusing to follow these new writers of history as they proceed. They report, for example, that a Kamshad woman cannot be moved, even by the greatest promises, to wash clothes, repair them or perform other household duties—from which presumably comes the 'high' culture of Kamshadalia. Particular attention has been paid to Egypt. Diodor and Strabo, as well as Herodotus, have been scoured for evidence to interpret signs of female worship as evidence that Egypt was ruled by women. This is said to be proven by the inscription over the sculptures of King Ramses and his wife on a gate. It is written there: "See, what the goddess wife speaks, the royal mother, the mistress of the world." They alleged that this proves that the queen stood above the king. The words spoken about the mother are totally ignored. Further, they allege that the male Egyptian principally performed the household tasks while the women ruled. Let us, for a moment, agree. Simply stated, the doctrine fails because we can and have been trying to show that women founded no states. They have not created science. It is merely because they were oppressed?

But simultaneously, naturally, unwillingly, another thing is proved: that women with, or in spite of all, freedom have neither founded nor maintained a state. For Egypt was not a women's state. From King Menes (approximately 3,400 B.C.) onward, the history of the Egyptian state is the history of men. The first king's tomb is that of Chent whose government created the foundation of Egyptian culture. The king is the incarnation of Horus; even after death he can "take wives away from husbands, whence he wishes, if his heart is seized by the desire. . .The God," he is called, "the great house—pharaoh."

Royalty finds its rigid limitations in the ceremonial, in the typifying arrangement of law, in the observance of which its divinity is linked. Each of the kings built his own residence according to his capacity; his own

sarcophagus, as a memorial. The rhythm of ordinary life was determined by the official, the chamberlain, the technician, or in short, the "scribe." After periods of unrest, Amenehet I struggled toward creative power. The classical period of Egypt had begun. The fact that the Egyptian male state allowed the greatest freedom for women shows that there can, in fact, be rule by women but not a female state per se. This concept is a contradiction in itself, just as the term "men's state" represents a tautology.

Things are not as simple as, nor are they solved by, establishing an equilibrium between a male and a female political system. The establishment of equal rights is not, despite claims to the contrary, a cultural goal worth striving for. A "swing of the pendulum" away from the formation of a male type does signify a time of degeneracy. The pendulum does not swing over to form a new type; rather it lands in a swamp. Rule by women is an example of absolutely nothing. For a European race—and not only for it—a time of rule by women is a time of decay in the structure of life. With further perpetuation, it signifies the decline of a culture, and of the race.

Even if women have become rulers during the course of European history, through dynastic succession, whether they have ruled well or badly, they did this within, and supported by the existing form of a male state. They have subordinated and adapted themselves to his type, in order after death to once again make room for a man. Ministers, generals and soldiers, represented by women—this would be the prerequisite for a "Women's state."

As monarchy ended in France, women were of necessity brought into positions of influence. The aristocratic lady possessed all the rights of the feudal lords. She could raise troops and collect taxes. Female landed property owners on a large scale had positions on, and voting rights in, the representative bodies of their class. Some, for example, as Madame de Sevigne did, indeed, become peers of France. In the self-disintegrating guilds, the female masters could even determine the professional right to vote.

Some ideas of the French Revolution included the liberation of women. Its spokeswomen were the *demi-monde* women Olympe de Gouges and Theroigne de Mericourt. As long as the revolutionaries fought, women could not use the rights which they had possessed under the old regime. Later, they drew advantage from the Democratic victory. Napoleon was much hated by emancipated women on account of his anti-feminist *Code Napoleon.*

The Americans, who granted women equal rights from the very beginning, are praised for this, but then, this was to be expected. If one studies the history of the United States, then he clearly notices two types of rule by women in American society despite the fact that it has a male state. The American man still ruthlessly forces his will on society. The ceaseless hunt for the dollar almost exclusively governs his existence. His "culture" is represented by sport and technology. All paths of art, science and politics stand open to the emancipated woman. Her social position is undoubtedly superior to the male. The consequence of this rule by women in America is the strikingly low cultural level of the nation. A real cultural and vital type will come into existence in America only when the chase after the dollar has been tamed and when the contemporary technological man has begun to think about the nature and aim of existence. Emerson represented the first reflective moment in America. But unfortunately, this was only a moment. In spite of the social predominance of woman the state is, nevertheless, by necessity, masculine. If diplomacy and national defense were also female-controlled, then America could not maintain its existence as a state.

The essence of the State can be very different in content, but, from a formal aspect, it must always exercise power. Power is won and maintained in this world only through struggle, in the struggle for life and death. If we are to seriously regard the female demand for political power, then we must assume they can maintain that power with a female army. It is not necessary to discuss this absurdity or the organic impossibility of such a thing. Venereal diseases would rapidly increase in the Army and racial decay through miscegenation would be unavoidable. Even a mixed male-female army would become but a huge brothel.

The present day State is accused of dual morality. The fact is, that in the first instance, it created and preserved the family and not conversely. The fact is that it is the male State, which, for example, lays a duty upon the male party, whether guilty or not, in a divorce to maintain his divorced wife in a manner to which she is accustomed. But one never hears from women who call for "equal rights" that in the case of unfaithfulness by the wife, they wish to see an identical obligation laid upon her to care for the deceived husband. This would be a completely justified demand if no differences are to exist between the sexes. In actuality though, the campaigners for women's rights want nothing in their deepest nature more than to be maintained at the expense of the man. In America, things have gone so far that the one-sided law of divorce has

become entrenched almost everywhere. Beyond this, efforts are made to place a legal obligation upon the man to hand over a fixed percentage of his income to his wife.

Just as the Jews everywhere call for "equal rights" and by this mean only their own privileges—so the emancipated woman must eventually face the fact she is really not demanding equal rights, but a parasitical life at the expense of male strength. Moreover, she wishes to have social and political privileges. The man of the 19th century infected with liberalism has simply not understood this. The chaos of the present is the revenging angel which punishes liberal man for such forgetfulness.

Today, the awakening individual sees that the god of the ballot paper is an empty scrap of rag without importance. The universal, identical, secret yet direct, voting right is not a magic wand but a tool of disintegration in the hands of *Volk*-hostile demagogues. Is this universal right to vote then to be taken away from women? Yes! But also from men! A *Volkish* State will not undertake to make major decisions through anonymous male and female voting masses. Such decisions will be made by responsible personalities.

Liberalism taught freedom of movement, free trade, parliamentarianism, emancipation of women, equality of men, human equality, equality of the sexes, etc. In this, it sinned against a natural law that creation only arises through the release of polar-conditioned tensions. That is, a high degree of energy is necessary to perform work of any kind. To create culture. Today, in the midst of the collapse of the feminized old world, the German idea demands type-forming strength, restriction, discipline, protection of racial character and a straightforward recognition of the eternal polarity of the sexes.

* * *

The cry for equal rights, or more correctly, for the female state, has a very characteristic undercurrent. The demand to be able to create freely in science, law and politics, shows "Amazonlike" features, i.e., tendencies to be competitive with man in decidedly male domains; to appropriate his knowledge, ability and actions and to imitate his diverse activities in life. But alongside this goes the demand for erotic freedom and the removal of sexual restraints.

The purely individualistic idea, the leading cause of all decadent social and political conditions, also dissolved the strict masculine form of discipline which is natural to all nations. If one were now of the opinion that

woman should activate all her powers in order to protect her children from the consequences of dissolution, then what we see is emancipation doing exactly the opposite. Woman demands the right to enjoy "erotic freedom" within her female sex. Serious-minded individual women have certainly opposed this impulsiveness. Nevertheless the "erotic revolution" has been extensively implanted through the efforts of the campaigners for women's rights. Now, the type-forming, liberated woman appeared. She seeks the formative power to continue her species. Liberationist Anna Augspurg wrote, "A woman who possesses self-respect, cannot enter into a legal marriage." This can be regarded as the gospel of the erotic programme. Made bold by a violent emphasis on the "value of personality" and "self-determination" crazed women threw away the last protection of their sex and destroyed the last thing which offers them and their children security in life. The emancipated woman responded by demanding that the State assume sole responsibility for the care of her children. What State? Is the State then to become nothing but a welfare institution that will take care of the consequences of unbridled sexuality? Here, there is the denial of the idea of duty on one's own part when irresponsible demands are made upon others. What we mean to say is that a truly emancipated State does not exist at all. For, without the concept of duty the survival of a State is inconceivable over the long run. The campaigner for women's rights curses marriage as legal prostitution, but, if in place of the man, it is the "State" which pays, how is anything altered in the whole affair?

If man only thought subjectively, that is without relationship to the community, then ultimately he could attempt to justify this. He could go from one woman to another, amusing himself according to his capabilities with the woman left to foot the bill if she is left pregnant. The necessary consequences of the doctrine of emancipation are of great concern to us. Ruth Bra warned women against the liberated polygamous male who might hit upon the incredible idea of experimenting with a large number of free marriages. "Free love" would be at an end and women would prescribe the necessary measure of love's joys to men.

As is known, other "emancipated" women have found other ways out. They have experimented with abortion and contraception. "Already, the time draws enticingly near when scientists will succeed in discovering harmless ways to destroy the fetus. A gay outlook for all those who are not obsessed by the *rage du nomber*." So wrote the Stocker woman in *Mutterschutz*. This longing outcry by a prophetess naturally also has a "scientific" underlayer. As far as abortion is concerned, we offer the

opinion that this is only an offense because the State is governed by men. Things would be completely different in a State run by women. Then women would automatically be granted permission to destroy the fetus. Abortions are permitted only as a female right tied to the physical freedom of woman. Liberationists note with pride, that the Swiss canton of Basle already permits abortion. These experts on the liberation of women time and again find themselves, along with their enthusiastic followers, in an agreeable, united front with Democracy and Marxism, all of which aim at the decomposition and destruction of our race. From the right to absolute personal freedom necessarily follows the denial of racial barriers. Our emancipated women lay claim to the right to have sexual intercourse with blacks, Jews, Chinese. Women, as the chosen preservers of the race, can also become the destroyers of all foundations of the *Volkhood*, if permitted to complete their emancipation. These "truly emancipated" women have disregarded every moral restriction along with the concept of honor and duty. They recognize only the concepts and ideas of "development," "ratios of power," "relayering." But the idea of degeneracy, the necessary counterpart to the idea of development, is almost completely disregarded. They, therefore, speak little about the fact that with an increasing drive toward a "women's State," female, as well as male, prostitution would proliferate. However, we need not fear greatly that such a thing will happen, but only because men are not psychologically disposed to allow such an abomination to occur.

A powerful group of "emancipated" women, including Ms. Elbertskirchen, Ms. Meisel-Hess, and Ms. Augspurg, naturally opposes prostitution, but not on general moral grounds. Rather, they simply wish to insure lifelong security for other women. How dishonorable the struggle of this group is! This can be seen in the fact that although they will not recognize any marital bonds for themselves, they do lay claim to "free" love for life.

A preview of conditions in the hypothetical female State is provided in certain centers of our democratically controlled great cities. Delicately tripping dolls in lacquered shoes and lilac stockings, hung with bracelets, with fragile rings on their fingers, with blue eyelids and red lips—these are the "types" which would become universal in the coming female state. Emancipated women do not look upon all this as decline and decay. They see it as a "swing of the pendulum" away from the hated men's State and toward the women's paradise, as an allegedly necessary historical development. As a result, every difference in value is given up, every

bastard, every cretin swollen with pride, can regard himself as a necessary member of human society and lay claim to the right of license and equal rights.

The abortion movement can be described as an act of despair in the face of present day social conditions. It is one thing to promote the decline of the people and yet another to attack it with passionate will. A State power which sets as its goal the elimination of its children corrupts us all. This signifies total racial and cultural decline. This practice denies the possibility of salvation for women and men, for our entire people.

In the face of present conditions Nordic man is absolutely not to be taken under state protection. On the contrary, he is, in the first place, responsible for the crises in contemporary life. But his guilt lies in a completely different direction from where the emancipated woman seeks it! His crime is that of not having been any longer a complete man. For the same reason woman has frequently ceased to be a woman. The man became devoid of an outlook on the world, of a *Weltanschauung*. He has allowed his former religious faith to collapse and his scientific conceptualization to become shaky. He has also lost his type-and-style-forming power in all domains. Therefore liberated woman reached out for the helm of State as an "Amazon." She therefore demanded an erotic anarchy as proof of her emancipation. But she has not emancipated herself from the masculine State. She only betrayed the honor of her own sex and of nature.

With the Oriental peoples, religion linked with prostitution was quite customary. The priests nowhere allowed themselves to be deprived of this satisfaction. The same was likewise true of the pious Babylonian and Egyptian women. Initially they refused enforced prostitution, but eventually they gave in. The history of the goddess Ishtar is instructive. We see in the metamorphosis of this deity the decline of a people. At first she was the maidenly goddess of hunting, indeed, of war. During Hammurabi's time she was still represented with a beard. Then she was held to be queen of heaven, goddess of love and fertility. Under Phoenician influences she became the protective spirit of "religious" prostitution. Later, as Astarte, she became the symbol of sexual anarchy. As a result, Babylon was dissolved as a State and as a type; it was finished.

Whoever wishes to avert European decline must release himself from the liberal, State-disintegrating view of the world and gather all forces, men and women, each in the allotted sphere, under the watchwords of racial protection, *Volkish* strength and State discipline.

* * *

An evaluating judgement of woman has naturally not been made with the preceding observations. However, it represents a decisive insight for the cultivation of a future generation of German-conscious men and women that man proceeds in life by inventing, shaping and synthesizing in the world; whereas woman proceeds lyrically. If the average man in ordinary life does not always reveal great intellectual architectonics, it remains a fact that great foundations of State, codes of law, type-forming organizations of the political, military and churchly kind, comprehensive philosophical and creative systems, symphonies, dramas and sacred buildings have all been created by the synthesizing masculine spirit. Opposed to this, the woman represents a world which in its beauty and originality, is not inferior to that of the man. It faces his in equal rank. The "Amazonlike" emancipated woman—as we have seen—is guilty of the crime of making women lose the high respect due her nature. It incorporated the values of the man into her own. This signifies a spiritual disturbance, a remagnetizing of the femal nature. Similarly, the "modern," instead of concerning himself with the architectonics and synthetics of existence, began to worship the idols of humanity, love of mankind, pacifism, the liberation of slaves, etc. It is also erroneous if one regards all of this as only stages, not as permanent. Despite the liberation of the "emancipation" movement, woman has not become architectonic but merely intellectual—as "Amazon"—or purely erotic—as representative of the sexual revolution. In both cases she has forfeited her innermost essence and has still not attained masculinity. The same also holds conversely, for the "emancipated" man.

From the standpoint of woman; State, code law, science and philosophy could be regarded as something external. What then is the purpose of the existence of forms, schemas or consciousness? Is the spontaneous flow of things, the unconscious in living experience of what is deepest not great and beautiful? Must one always have need of works in order to prove the existence of a soul? And are these forms and works of the man often not born out of an atmosphere of the lyrical-feminine which would not have come into existence without the woman?

Life is being and becoming, consciousness and sub-consciousness simultaneously. In his eternal becoming, the man seeks to create a being through the formation of ideas and works. These things form the *world* as an organic-architectonic structure. Woman is the eternal guardian of the sub-conscious.

The Nordic-Germanic myths represent the goddess Freya as the protectoress of eternal youth and beauty. If one robbed the gods of her, then

they would age and decline. Through her relationship to Loki primeval mythic wisdom is revealed. Loki was a bastard of the gods. There was once a lengthy discussion concerning whether he should be recognized as being of equal rank to other gods in Valhalla. Finally, this was granted. This bastard Loki played the role of contractor when Odin's fortress was to be rebuilt by giants. He then offered Freya as payment! When the gods heard of this agreement, they refused to honor it, whereupon Loki cheated the giants. Then Odin, the guardian of the law, himself fell into the pangs of guilt. His attempt to make expiation was the downfall of Valhalla. In this mythos we find a deep perception which is awakening again only today. The bastard thoughtlessly handed over the symbol of racial immortality, of eternal youth, and thus pulled the noble into participation in his guilt. What may Odin indeed have whispered into the ears of dead Baldur when he accompanied him on his last journey?

Translated into present day language, the Germanic mythos says: In the hand and in the nature of woman lies the preservation of our race. A people can still pull itself up out of political servitude, but never again from racial pollution. If the women of a nation give birth to black or Jewish bastards, if the muddy tide of black "art" passes unhindered over Europe as today, if the Jewish brothel literature comes into homes, if the Syrian of the *Kurfurstendamm* is also regarded as a *Volksgenosse* and a marriageable man—then such conditions will ensure that Germany—and the whole of Europe—will be populated in its intellectual centers by bastards. With the teaching of erotic "rebirth," the Jew of today reaches out—aided by the teachings of emancipation of women—at the roots of our entire being. Just when an awakening Germany will reach the stage of carrying out a merciless cleansing with an iron broom and with ruthless discipline is uncertain. But, if anywhere, then in the preaching of remaining pure in race, lies the holiest and greatest task of woman today. This means the guarding and preserving of that unconscious, of that still unconcentrated, but particularly original, life. We speak here of the life upon which the substance of art, architectonics and of our racial culture are dependent. Those values which alone make us creative.

But instead of heeding this most important and greatest need of all, many women still listen to the decoying cry of the enemies of our race and *Volkhood* and are ready in all seriousness—for the sake of ballot paper and parliamentary seats—to declare war unto the death on men. Apparently, so that she will not remain a "second class citizen of the state," woman has been incited to work for the "right to vote," as if, under the present rule by money, our destiny is actually decided by elections!

Meanwhile, the instinct toward choosing a man is dirtied by open and secret soul and race polluting magazines and books. Woman today brings money into the Jewish stores from whose display windows the glittering decadence of a corrupt time shines forth, while present day liberal and lukewarm man is too weak to stem the entire current. The lyrical passion of woman which, in times of privation, can become just as heroic as the formative will of the man, seems to have been long buried. It is the task of the real woman to clear away this rubble. Emancipation of women from the "emancipation of woman" is the first demand of a female generation which wishes to save *Volk* and race—the eternal-unconscious, the foundation of all culture—from decline.

The age of Victorianism and the "dreamy romantic girl's life" are naturally finished once and for all. Woman belongs deeply to the total life of the people. All educational opportunities must remain open to her. Through rhythmical exercises, gymnastics and sport the same care must be given to her physical training as is the case with a man. Nor should any difficulties be created for her in the vocational world under present-day social conditions, in which respect the law for the protection of mothers should be more strongly implemented.

Doubtless, however, the efforts of those who would renew our *Volkdom* after breaking up the *Volk*-alien-Democratic-Marxist system, must prepare the way for a social order which no longer forces young women—as is the case today—to stream in droves to the labor markets of life which consume the most important feminine energies. Hence all possibilities for the development of a woman's energies should remain open to her. But we must be clear on one point: only men must be and remain judges, soldiers, and rulers of state. Today these professions demand more than ever an unlyrical, indeed, tough, attitude, recognizing only what corresponds to a type and what is *Volkish*. If we give up here we act forgetfully of our duty toward past and future. The hardest man must still be hard enough for the iron future. When the death penalty is fixed for mocking of race and *Volk*, when the jail awaits those who pollute the race, then we will need nerves of steel and rugged formative powers until what is "monstrous"—to some—has at last become self-evident.

Different souls must not be levelled, "equilibrated," but must be regarded as to organic essence, cultivated in their peculiarities. The architectonic and lyricism of existence is a dual chord. Man and woman are the poles producing the electricity of life. The stronger every essence is, for itself, the greater the effect of labor, the cultural value and life-will of the entire people will be. Whoever arrogates to himself the power to

undermine this law must find his decisive enemies in the real man and the real woman. If no one protects himself any longer against racial and sexual chaos, then decline has become irreversible.

In the first book, the highest value of the Teutons has been extensively dealt with. This is served—in a different manner—by the German man and the German woman. But to cultivate it as a life-type can and must be the task of the man, of a league of men. We stand in the midst of an enormous process of fermentation. Many personalities and bodies still struggle against the Medieval church and Freemasonry but only in an instinctive, negative, defensive fight. They are still disunited because the type of the future must first be worked out and the supreme value of honor has not yet been unconditionally accepted. The great idea emanates from a few, but in order to form others into leaders, these few must tolerate in leading posts only personalities to whom the ideas of honor and duty have become the supreme values. All who give way—from whatever reasons—will ultimately have a harmful effect on the future. Power, soul and racial adjustment must coincide in order to help the coming type. To carry this out is the first and last task of a leader of the German future.

* * *

The German Reich, if it is to continue to exist after the revolution of 1933, will be the work of a league of men conscious of their goal. These men must be clear concerning what value is to be regarded as supreme in the coming life of the nation. This highest value, around which all remaining commandment of life must be grouped, must correspond to the innermost essence of the people. For only then will it tolerate the necessary tough discipline. This discipline will last decades. We must bear this discipline gladly. This one single innermost turning point must, however, be completed. From it everything else results.

Out of the dogma of the "representation of God" the Papacy created its moral, theoretical and effective practical political power. This mythical based dogma alone determined—until the present day—the types and the history of peoples who number in the millions. Today, this dogma is consciously and ruthlessly rejected and combated. And, through a faith likewise growing to mythical power, it will be replaced by a belief in one's own soul and race values. The idea of honor—national honor—not Christian love, not Freemasonic humanity, not the Roman philosophy.

All the forces which formed our soul had their origins in great personalities. As thinkers, they had the effect of setting an aim; unveiling an

essence as poets; type-forming as statesmen. They were all somehow typical dreamers of themselves and of their people.

Goethe did not cultivate a type. Far more he signified a universal enrichment of all existence. Many of his words brought bubbling forth the hidden spiritual sources which otherwise perhaps might have not broken through. This occurred in all domains of life. Goethe represented our essence in *Faust*. The eternal, which, after every recasting of our soul, is inherent in the new form. As a result, Goethe has become the guardian and the preserver of our disposition. He is a figure such as our people possessed at no previous time. When the times of bitter struggle are finally over, Goethe will once again begin to have a perceptible outward effect. However, in the coming decades he will pass into the background, because to him the power of a type-forming idea was hateful. In life, as in composing poetry, he did not wish to recognize any dictatorship of an idea. Without such an idea a people never remains a people and will never create a true state. Just as Goethe forbade his son to participate in the German war of liberation and had to leave the smith's hammer of destiny in the hands of Stein, Scharnhorst and Gneisenau, so would he—if living among us today—not be a leader in the struggle for freedom and for the new shaping of our century. There exists no real greatness without the limitation of sacrifice. This man, infinitely rich of mind, could not concentrate and ruthlessly follow one course.

Jesus also is no former of a type but an enricher of souls. Gregory "the Great," Gregory VII, Innoncence III, and Boniface VIII have allotted the personality of Jesus a place in the Roman league of priests. He became the servant of his "slaves" for exactly the opposite purpose than he had conceived. Similarly with Saint Francis. On the other hand, Mohammed and Confucius were strong type-creating powers. They stuck to one goal, outlined paths. Mohammed enforced the following of his teachings, while Confucius, with a more quiet effect, created and preserved Chinese *Volkhood*. In a fundamentally similar way to Mohammed, Ignatius Loyola formed a type. He consciously trod under foot men's feelings of honor, set a new goal for ideas, revealed exact means and ways and was thus a conscious cultivator of souls. Beyond this, the Jesuit spirit also created a physiognomically determined outward type, so to speak.

We experience a similar phenomenon in the art realm. Here there are personalities who are unique, who do not create a universal style and others, conversely, who live as type-forming. A Michelangelo, for example, has enriched art as only a few have done, but a continuation of his

mode of working would lead to chaos. The same may hold of Rembrandt and Leonardo. Raphael, on the other hand, has proven a great type-power, similar to Titian and Greek art.

A related phenomenon is also offered by political life. Alexander gave birth to, and embodied the idea of, world empire. Rome seized upon this idea. The personal name of Caesar then grows into the monarchs' title of Kaiser and Czar. A type of ruler who was favored by God arose, linked with the Roman church. Napoleon signified an equally strong revolutionary power like Caesar, but, until the present, this type had only the effect of uprooting. It was not initially type-creating. In another way, Luther shattered the alien crust over our life, but neither in a religious nor in the State aspect did he represent a type. He had to liberate our disposition to strike a blow against the rock, in order to free a passage for the spring of life to gush forth. That it took so long—until the great Prussian kings—before a man was found to force the latter into an organic river bed, signified the tragedy of later German history.

In face of the collapse of the German Reich after scarcely 44 years of existence, one final question—apart from those already dealt with at the beginning—now arises: Was a type-forming power in the State operative in 1870 generally or not? Yes and no. I believe that Bismarck—as far as the consequences of his achievements and their driving force, but not his mode of operation are concerned—will one day be judged like Luther. He belongs among those natures who, gifted with a rarely seen will, can lay their stamp onto an entire epoch, yet create around themselves a desolation, sown with trodden personalities who had failed to unconditionally subordinate themselves. For decades, the complaint has been raised that Bismarck, out of a feeling of his own absolute superiority, regarded all ministeries as mere private offices and the ministers as caretakers of his chancellory. However foolishly and unwisely Wilhelm II may have behaved towards Bismarck, and however mediocre his talents may appear from reading his *Ereignisse und Gestalten*, a correct picture is nevertheless contained in them. Wilhelm compared Bismarck with an unexpected block of stone in an open field. If one rolled it away, then only worms were to be found under it. That is the symbol of our political history during the past fifty years. The Imperial idea of 1871 was only a gazing back at the inwardly dead rule of Kaiserism "by the grace of God." At the same time, it was linked in an unruly marriage with chaotic Liberalism. Only a Bismarck was still successful in blowing a hot breath of life into this inorganic structure. In the feeling of his irreplaceability, his masterful consciousness of duty was enhanced to admit no successor of independent

nature. Germany's history would not have been essentially altered if Wilhelm I had left Bismarck still in office. Thus, the great man created and carpentered the Reich with one hand and, with the other, cast the firebrand into his own house. No other political power was at hand to avert the fortune.

But alongside Bismarck a personality was at work. We attribute the fact that Germany did not decline to this figure. This man, Moltke, must be thanked for making possible the four and a half years of heroic struggle in the World War. We take this point of reference from Spengler. This creator of the great general staff was the strongest type-forming power since Frederick the Great. He was not the man to weld the soul of the people by verbal political argument, but it was he who helped to greatly cultivate existing personality-values and to form the consciousness of individual responsibility into the prerequisite of all actions. The ratio carried through by Moltke between the responsible general and his chief of staff was the exact counterpart of what Bismarck did in diplomacy. Bismarck had made efforts to make his ministers financially dependent. The direct subordinate was obligated to represent his views with all acuteness, to provide a basis for them and, with opposite commands, to have them made into protocol. This principle, carried out from above to below, was furthered through definitions which all had the single aim of making the German soldier—in spite of the strictest discipline—into a self-reliant, thinking and resolutely acting man and fighter. That was the secret of German successes in the first world war. In spite of unavoidable human feelings, the type of the German soldier developing from the Prussian officer of Frederick the Great is eloquent proof of the fact that the methods of Graf Moltke are the only path to salvation for the rising Third Reich, if we wish to avoid collapse once again after a liberating revolution of intoxicating joy.

Moltke was a personality of merciless consequentiality. But his dynamism never poured itself out in terrifying outbreaks like that of Luther or Bismarck. He rarely withdrew into equally deep spiritual contrition like the souls of the other two. Nonetheless, Moltke had a compelling effect upon his environment; compelling, not depressing. Germany's second Reich was founded on the battlefield. It was created by Bismarck. But it was preserved by the personality and type-creating power of Moltke's genius. After Bismarck, loud nonentities with directionless flattering natures became chancellors of the Reich. These men fluctuated between his teachings and those of the liberalizing forces. They led the German people into the net of hostile, goal-conscious diplomats. But it also hap-

pened that a great number of outstanding generals and soldiers arose from the grey-clad German army, such as all the rest of the world could not show. From 1914 to 1918 the real German Reich was not in Germany; it stood at the front on the Falkland Isles, at Tsingtau, in German East Africa, in the Indian Ocean and in the sky over England. Worms sat upon ministerial seats in Germany. They did not know what should be done with the most powerful State in the field.

It was not the fault of the system devised by Moltke, that if before the war the officer type became more and more alienated from the rest of the people, became a caste, and, finally, began to reveal the bad side of a divisiveness which was inorganic for Germany. An officer class based only on honor had to separate itself more and more from unscrupulous traders and stock exchange swindlers. But in order to carry through this separation, abrupt boundaries had to be drawn which seemed humanly unpleasant. They were quite necessary; for the purpose of slandering the Jewish press and selflessly defending Germany, these officers sacrificed themselves on the battlefields. They also shaped those who, from 1914 to 1918, put on the grey uniform of honor for the first time.

Bourgeois and Marxist Germany had become mythless. It no longer had a supreme value in which it believed, for which it was ready to fight. It wished to conquer the world "peacefully" by means of trade and to fill its money bags. It had already sunk so low in its trading and usury that it was astonished when this did not please other peoples, when alliances were formed against the danger from German commercial travelers. In August, 1914, the supreme value of the army of Moltke became the highest value of the people. Everything which was still real and great threw aside the philosophy of the trader. It thanked the German soldier for protecting the national idea of honor. Moltke seemed to triumph. Then he was retired by the supreme commander. Instead of now—after many years of lack of concern for the supreme values of our people—seizing the opportunity and hanging upon the gallows that rabble which had spat upon him for years, the Kaiser reached his hand out to the Marxist leaders, rehabilitated those guilty of treason and set up worms as masters in a State that was fighting for its existence. Later, together with his people, he received the thanks paid out to him by these worms on the 9th of November, 1918.

It is beyond question that it is the Moltke-type, during the first period of a future Germany, which will form our league of men—let us call it the German Order. This group must step strongly into the foreground in order to save us in the present chaotic confusion. There is also a need for

preachers with Luther-like natures who hypnotize, and for writers who consciously remagnetize hearts. The Lutherlike leader in the coming Reich must, however, be clear about the fact that he must unconditionally abandon the system of Bismarck after victory. He must transfer the principles of Moltke to politics if he wishes not only to realize himself, but, also, beyond his death, to create a permanent Reich sworn to a highest value. Whatever shape things may take, whether eruptive, or form-creating powers, both must only be of the essence of the Nordic soul. Since the descendants of completely alien races have filtered into Europe, one cannot form a Germanic-Reich-German-Nation. One then hands over the future to the "free play of forces" in the political realm such as were elevated into principles in the economic sphere after 1871. But then all sacrifices in spirit and blood will have been made in vain. After a short time, the same "Democracy" will come to the helm and the German war of liberation will be only an episode on the way to decline, not a symbol of a new, yet most passionately striven-for, ascent.

A belief, a mythos, is only real when it had grasped the entire man. In the best interests of the future, all political, tactical and propagandist considerations must step back. Frederick the Great's concept of honor, Moltke's method of discipline and Bismarck's sacred will—these are the three powers which, embodied in different personalities in varied mixture, serve only one thing: the honor of the German nation. It is the mythos which must determine the type of the future German. If one has recognized this, then it will have already begun to take shape in the present.

III. Volk and State

VOLK, State, Churches and Army have stood in very different ratios of power to one another during the course of our history. The victory of Roman Christianity signified the abandonment of the organic Germanic ideas of the king as a measuring rod of worldly action. We have, in its stead, the ethereal idea of emperor which was arrogated by the church as the legacy of ancient Rome. A thousand years passed until—beginning with Henry the Lion or Heinrich der Lowe, and continued by Brandenburg—the Nordic kingdom renewed itself while the Roman emperorship declined in the swamp of the House of Habsburg. Admittedly, the Staufers were also self-sufficient enough to declare their Imperium as German and independent of Rome. At the meeting at Besancon, for example, the Papal delegates who described the Imperium as a Papal endowment, were beaten half-dead by the counts and dukes of Friedrich II. Nevertheless, this self-consciousness was not built upon a doctrine firmly laid down in principle of the predominance of emperor over Pope. Thus it was not a tradition or a perpetuated type-forming force.

Rome had falsified its claim to power, beginning with the forgeries known as "the Donation of Constantine" about 750. The fact that Constantine was baptized as an Arianist, is suppressed. Pope Hadrian I lied to Charlemagne when he asserted that this "Decretal" was to be found in

the Vatican archives. The deluded king of the Franks accepted in principle the predominance of the Roman bishop despite the fact that in the year 800 the Pope had thrown himself on his knees before Charlemagne.

The subsequent Popes, on the basis of these falsified documents, laid claim to their legal and traditionally established predominance. This happened despite the fact that these documents were proven forgeries. An entire literature was devoted to the establishment of the prime rights of the Church over the crown. These claims were accepted until the high tide mark was reached in the Bull *Unam Sanctum* issued by Pope Boniface VIII. In this document Boniface declared that "It is a requirement of salvation that every creature be subject to the Roman Pope." This Bull was expressly described by the Jesuit-General Werntz who died in 1914 as a "definition of dogma" which "solemnly recorded the relationship between Church and State for eternity." Other church teachers passed judgement in exactly the same way. As a result other pronouncements followed concerning oaths to the State. The Jesuit Lehmkuhl, counselor of the German Center Party, declared that it was clear that State civil oaths could "never" be binding as a duty if they were opposed to "church law." Since, however, this "right called for the subordination of the State to the Church, then what Rome had demanded was that no oaths be recognized which are not "sanctified" by the church. The Jesuit Sanchez attributed to the church the power to declare oaths null and void and the Jesuit Lehmkuhl openly defended military desertion. Indeed, he obligated Catholics to do this in the event they were forced to participate in "an unjust war"—such as 1866 and 1870.

This unequivocal position of the Roman Church toward the State represents a natural counterpiece seen from the standpoint of the idea of the German Volk state.

After the collapse of absolute monarchy in 1789, Democratic principles struggled with the National idea. Separated from the start, and later bringing both movements into rigidity, a new doctrine of power alien to the blood was formulated which reached its peak in Hegel. It was then taken over in renewed falsification by Karl Marx who equated State with class rule. Today, we confront the problem. The State has delievered itself and the people to the dishonorable forces of trade. It has appeared to the broad masses more and more as a soulless tool of violence. The views of Hegel concerning the absolutist State in itself became predominant during recent years in Germany, and not only in Germany. The official moved more and more into a position of master and forgot, thanks to the identical attitude of those ruling, that he was nothing other than a

representative of the entire *Volk* whose duty it is to fulfill the technical or political needs of the *Volk*. "The State" and the "State official" thus became separated from the organic body of the people and appeared as a special mechanical apparatus toward the latter, in order to lay claim to control over life. Millions took a hostile attitude against this development, but since no opponent dared to appear openly in the national camp, those who were discontented moved to the side of international social democracy, although they inwardly really were not Marxists.

The revolt of 1918 altered nothing in all this because the Marxists naturally had really nothing in common with the German people. They strove only for the establishment of fixed international principles, using the old technical apparatus, and "the State in itself" appeared again in active opposition to the "enemies of the State." The roles were all exchanged and the soulless essence remained. But this essence had become far more distinct after 1918, because "the State" had earlier, on occasion, stood in the way of open enemies of the people; but now, in the person of its judges, the State was forced to imprison men whose lives and actions were devoted only to service and sacrifice for the people.

State and *Volk* thus often confronted each other openly as enemies. From 1918 to 1933 they even appeared as deadly enemies. Our destiny will be shaped according to the manner in which this inner conflict is resolved.

Today, the State is no longer a separated idol before which we are all supposed to lie in the dust. The State does not even have a purpose unless it acts to preserve the concept of *Volk*. The State is only one means to do this. Church, law, art and science must do likewise. State forms change and State laws pass away, but the *Volk* concept remains. It follows from this that the nation is the first and last consideration to which everything else is to be subordinated. And it also follows from this that there can be no State judges, only People's judges. Unless this be true the entire legal foundation of life would alter. The only other possible result would be such degrading conditions as have been common during the last decade. One and the same State attorney had earlier to represent the Kaiser's State, then the Republican. An "independent" judge was likewise dependent upon one basic system. Thus it is possible that, on the basis of Roman "law," the State attorney as "servant of the State" in the name of "the people" hindered the *Volkish* guiding of the people. Abstract "popular sovereignty" of Democracy and the contemptuous words of Hegel—"The People is that part of the State which does not know what it

wants''—have produced the same insubstantial scheme of so-called "State authority."

But the authority of the Volkhood stands higher then this "authority of State." Whoever does not regard this as so is an enemy of the people, even if it be the State itself. Such was the situation until 1933.

This was the view from one side but it must be said concerning the content of the other, that an unconditional conformity is just as un-*Volkish* as the old State law. The question of the monarchy—and of the monarch—is also a question of utility—in all events in the highest sense—and not a dogmatic one. Those who regard it as such do not differ essentially in their character-structure from the Social Democrats who, in a certain sense, are conformist Republicans who have no consideration for what might otherwise happen to the entire people. Thus, the correct, awakening instinct of the German people shows everywhere today. Thus it will ultimately become evident. The Republic will need to become *Volkish* or vanish. And a monarchy which, in advance, does not rid itself of certain old prejudices, could likewise not last, for it must necessarily perish from the same causes as the empire of Kaiser Wilhelm II.

The spirit of the future has today finally announced its demands. From the 30th of January, 1933 onward its rule has begun.

In the 17th century the retreat of the Pope began. The days of papal control over a world State were ended. In 1789, the dynasty, as an absolute value, made room for styleless liberalism. In 1871, the State began to make itself independent of the people; people which had actually first created it. Today, the people finally begins consciously to lay claim to the place rightfully befitting it.

* * *

The demand for freedom as well as the call for authority and type have almost everywhere been falsely posed and inorganically answered. Authority was demanded in Europe in the name of an abstract State principle or in the name of Liberal individualism and church universalism. In each case the claim was laid that all races and peoples had to subordinate themselves to this "God given" authority and its forms. The answer to this rigid dogma was the cry for unrestricted freedom—for anarchy. Rome and Jacobinism—in its old forms and in its later purest shaping in Babeuf and Lenin—actually condition one another inwardly.

The idea of freedom and the recognition of authority possess a completely different character within the present day racial-spiritual outlook

on the world. The idea of *Volkdom* is certainly not only of one race. It is also characterized by factors of a historical and spatial kind. However, it is nowhere the consequence of a uniform mixture of elements of different races. A State is always characterized by the supreme value, art, culture and style of the dominant race. Adding other races for variety advances nothing and loses much. These racial dominants demand the creation of a type. Truly organic freedom is only possible within such a type. This limitation is racially conditioned. Race is the outward image of a definite soul.

With this, the circle is closed. Jewish internationalism of a Marxist or Democratic kind likewise lies outside this true Germanic organism. Judaism operates in the same way as Roman authority with its claim to international validity together with all church claims to power.

In the deepest innermost sense, the longing for personality and type is the same. A strong personality has a style-forming effect, but the type—regarded metaphysically—is already given before it. Thus, personality is only its purest outward imprint. This eternal longing takes on another form in every epoch.

Around the turn of the 19th century we experienced the appearance of a great number of personalities who, with the blossoming of our entire culture, marked that era with an unforgettable stamp. For a long time the era of the machine destroyed personality-ideals as well as type-forming powers. The milieu, the factory, became master. A concept of mixed causality triumped over true science and philosophy. Marxist sociology—through its mass delusion, quantity doctrine—strangled the concept of quality in research. The stock exchange became the idol of the materialistic sickness of the times.

Nietzsche embodied the despairing cry of millions against the latter. His wild exclamations about the Superman were a violent extension of his subjected personal life which had been strangled by the material pressure of the times. Now, at least one man suddenly destroyed all values in fanatical rebellion. He raged wildly. A feeling of relief passed through the souls of all searching Europeans. That Nietzsche became insane, is symbolic. An enormous blocked up will to creation forged a path like a storm flood. The same will, inwardly broken long before, could no longer attain shape. An era, enslaved for generations, understood in its powerlessness only the subjective side of the great will and vital experience of Friedrich Nietzsche. It falsified the deepest struggle for personality into a cry for the unleashing of all instincts.

The Red standards then joined the banner of Nietzsche and the nomadic wandering Marxist preachers—the sort of men whose doctrine scarcely anyone else had unmasked with such derision as Nietzsche himself. In his name, racial pollution through Syrians and blacks was sanctified, although Nietzsche, in fact, strove for selective racial breeding. Nietzsche has fallen to the dreams of overheated political whores, which is worse than falling into the hands of robbers. The German people heard only of a release from all bonds, subjectivism, personality, and nothing about discipline and inward building-up. Hear Nietzsche's beautiful words:

> "From the future come winds with secret beat of wings and to sensitive ears comes good news."

These words represented a longing-filled apprehension in the midst of an insane world in which he, alongside Lagarde and Wagner, lived as almost the only ones with foresight.

This epoch of insanity now is finally dying. The strongest personality today no longer calls for personality, but for type: the *Volkish*, earth-rooted life-style. A new type of German man, "rectangular in body and soul," arises. The shaping of this man is the task of the 20th century. The true personality of today seeks to shape those features in their best form and to proclaim loudly those ideas which are a part of the new, and yet primordial, German type of man; a man who will become free not from, but *for*, something!

Type, like subjective personality, is not a schema. Type is the time-bound plastic form of an eternal racial-spiritual content. It is a life commandment, not a mechanical law. Such are eternal truths. The will to type is also the will to accept strict formative state discipline. Our generation has become rigidly undisciplined and conventional, and it must accept, or be subject to, rigid discipline.

With the vital experience of the type, that is with the birth of the recognition of the mythos of our entire history we witness the birth of the Nordic race soul and the inward recognition of its supreme values as the guiding star of our entire existence.

* * *

We would like to observe and affirm that the intangible idea of *Volk* honor has its roots in the strongest grounds of all, in the most material of all reality; in the farmland of a nation, in its living space.

The idea of honor is inseparable from the idea of freedom. Although one encounters versions of this idea, what is metaphysically deepest is undoubtedly the German creed founded by Eckehart, Luther, Goethe and Chamberlain. Their ideas shine so brilliantly for our times. In admitting that natural law and freedom are parallel ideas, coexisting necessarily in the human being, we come to the conclusion that this puzzle is incapable of solution or explanation. When our exterior is subjected to causal agents we respond just like other organic essences. When stimulations and motives are inside us, when our vision is linked with the will, our being remains untouched and untouchable. This is true however much it may be hindered purely mechanically by outward effects. For this reason alone men dispute this inward freedom but this proves that the will and freedom are present in men.

The greatest catastrophe of our intellectual life consisted in a sinful shift in the interpretation of the concept of freedom in German life, brought about by blood poisoning. This view came increasingly in vogue, as if freedom was synonymous with economic individualism. True freedom of research, thought and creativity was destroyed. Vision and will become more and more the servants of speculation and impulse. This movement of the new freedom into organic processes necessarily revealed an alienation from nature. Abstract and schematic economic and political doctrines no longer listened to the laws of nature, but followed its impulse to isolate the individual. Thus a seemingly small perceptive-critical displacement has brought enormous material misfortune all over the world. Day after day, a merciless nature takes its revenge until it will climax in the coming catastrophe. Then the so-called world trade together with its artificial, unnatural sub-structure, will collapse in a world catastrophe. If an external pressure does not need to break a strong personality it will at least destroy it mechanically. Such an attitude and pressure can poison a people. This was perpetrated against the German people when our leaders failed to provide adequate living space. In the 19th century our arable area became smaller and smaller. This was a crime against the still earth-linked farmers. The number of landless, propertyless Germans grew. Closely pressed, millions pushed into the world cities, and the human flood ever increased. Our directionless leaders called for industrialization, for export and world trade. In their need, they fell under the influence of Syrian conspirators who wished to turn the millions of the propertyless not into men hungry for living space, but into the Marxist-Jewish revolutionary proletariat. It sought also to incorporate those who still owned property. These parasites sought to exploit them through an

unattainable 'will o' the wisp' international world peace movement. With the theft of the idea of living space, the poisoning of our soul was achieved. The idea of *Volk* honor suddenly appeared as an insubstantial phantom. The prophets of the struggle for space were stamped as imperialist enemies of the people. Our just struggle for freedom was falsified, misled by Marxists, in order to end despairingly in the swamp of international communism.

The truly creative idea of freedom can only fully blossom within the totality of the *Volk*, when our race has air to breathe and land for farming. An effective vital honor will therefore only be seen at work in a nation which has sufficient living space at its disposal. Where the idea of national honor is elevated, the demand for space will be deeper. For this reason neither soil-alien Jewry nor soil-alien Rome recognizes the idea of honor. More precisely, they do not recognize this idea because there is no longing active within them for farmland. It is farmland upon which a strong and happy race scatters its fruit-bringing seed. Today, all the enemies of Germany attack our honor and they have also stolen Germany's living space. For these reasons in the final analysis, the metaphysical struggle revolves around the innermost values of character. It signifies a struggle for living space. One strengthens and reinforces the other. With sword and plow! For honor and freedom! So runs the battle-cry of a generation which wishes to erect a new Reich and which seeks standards of value by which it can judge its actions and its fruitful strivings. This battle-cry is nationalistic. And socialistic!

* * *

Socialism generally describes an ideology which demands the subordination of the individual to the will of a collective, be this class, church, state or people. But this fixed idea is completely devoid of content and allows free play to all arbitrary connotations since the essential content of the word is ignored. If social activity signifies private enterprise for the purpose of individual salvation from spiritual and material collapse, then socialism signifies the safeguarding of the individual essence carried through by a collective, or in entire communities, from every exploitation of their work.

Not every submission of the individual to the command of a collective is socialism, any more than every socialization signifies state control or nationalizing. One could regard monopoly as a kind of socialism which is what Marxism does in practice. Through its anti-life doctrine, Marxism

helps socialism to increase so that it concentrates power in a few hands. Such a concentration of power places the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat in control in the place of rule by the great world exploiters. Fundamentally, this signifies no alteration of circumstances. It is only world capitalism under other symbols. For this reason Marxism everywhere marches with democratic plutocracy. In the short run capitalism is the stronger.

If a measure is socialistic, it can be designed to be a preventive or revolutionary—disruptive—kind. What is determinative is collective, in whose name it establishes social-economic instruction. The bourgeois-parliamentary state legislates thousands of socialistic encroachments. It inflicts tragedy by favoring reparations on all enterprises through compulsory mortgages. It regulates tolls, loan interest and division of labor. In spite of this it is a class state, whose ruling parties do not pass socialistic measures. Rather, it lays its burden upon the entire people. Just as little can Marxism, which carries on its class struggle from below, lay claim to power for itself. The millions of people standing under Marxism's triumph are not treated as a totality. To a great degree they are mere objects, exploited by the Marxist-oriented members of the community. The work "State" was erroneously used under heretofore existing political conditions. The "state" stands neither in service of the bourgeoisie nor of the Marxist class struggle. Thus, it does not exist at all, however much its substitute demands worship. However much confessionalism and this double sided class struggle may strive, neither of them can pass and carry out a truly socialistic measure. This can only be done by the representative of a system which is able to grasp the people as an organism, which regards the state as a means to their external security and inner peace, to whom the totality 'nation' is thus the measuring rod for the individual and smaller collective restricting actions. Out of this thought process, for which the world has finally become ripe, we are witnessing the great struggle between nationalism and socialism.

The old nationalism was manifoldly not sincere. It was a mere cover for large agrarian and industrial, and later, finance-capitalist, private interests. For this reason, the words, "Patriotism is the last refuge of great scoundrels" (Dr. Samuel Johnson) could frequently be justified. Moreover, Marxism in the guise of social democracy was openly the adherent of plutocracy. The communistic *Volk*-destructive ravings against the property values of all nations are making real socialism possible. The result was not a struggle, but an equation of real nationalism with real

socialism, a synopsis with foundations. Germany has to thank Hitler for fabricating this synthesis.

A model socialistic measure was the transfer to state ownership of the German Reich railways (Reichsbahn). As a result, these facilities were withdrawn from arbitrary private control. In operational safety this act represented a *Volk*-preserving prerequisite which was for the good of every German. Another real socialistic measure was the communalizing of the electricity works and of the city water supplies, whose services are available to all without difference of class and religious creeds. Socialistic institutions are city mass transport, the police, the public libraries, etc. It is a matter of complete indifference whether these institutions were developed in a monarchy or a republic. The monarchy, as the examples of the German Reich railways and the 'Reichsbank' show, was fundamentally more socialistic than the Weimar republic which, after the signing of the Dawes dictate and other documented subjugations, brought much—bank and the railroad included—completely under the control of private—even foreign—financiers.

The struggle for existence and private welfare—often, a clever symbiosis—determine human public life. The first is a process of natural selection. The second is a purely human one established through deep, noble Christian good will toward one's neighbor. Both factors left on their own would signify the death of every culture, of every real *Volkish* state. Therefore, there exists no natural, and just as little no 'Christian,' idea of State. The real State of Germanic conception consists in that struggle for influence which is linked to definite prerequisites, allowing it to develop only under the rule of character values. Modern economic individualism as a principle of State therefore signifies the equating of a successful swindler with a man of honor. And so, after 1918, the usurper triumphed everywhere. *Caritas* for its part—as the alms of a dictator to oppressed millions, or as a personal act of good will—heals no wounds. It merely covers pestulant sores. It is the counterpiece to unrestricted exploitation. Occasionally, the greatest swindler even builds hospitals for his victims whom he has plundered over decades. He then has himself celebrated as a philanthropist by his newspapers.

Thus whoever wishes to be a nationalist today, must also be a socialist. The socialist of the field grey front of 1914-1918 wishes to have his life in the State. Without the State, Marxism will never be overcome and international capitalism will also never be made harmless. For these reasons it is understandable that a real socialistic measure—to be interpreted as such from its consequences—will be neutral toward the idea of private

property. It will recognize it where it ensures a security for the whole and will restrict it where it conceals dangers. For this reason, for example, the demand for state ownership of the railways and for personal real estate are both socialistic and nationalistic demands. Both serve the economically oppressed, in order to provide them with the prerequisite for cultural and state creations.

Therefore, from this standpoint, a completely different kind of light will shine upon many expressions of life which will benefit broad layers of the *Volk*.

We can directly follow the connection on the one hand between individualism and economic-universalism during the past 100 years in the political domain and, on the other hand, in the democratic and Marxist movements. The latter started out to establish the happiness of the individual and, at the same time, it proclaimed a culture of mankind which aimed at a Pan-Europe. In the final analysis it seeks a world republic, whether it be a republic of the men of the stock exchange or a dictatorship of the proletariat. The latter would become a protective form of dictatorship headed by the world bourse. The Dawes Plan and the Young Plan are both symbols of this combination of universalism with bloodless individualism. The result is that only reciprocal actions are recognized as organic between Ego (Individual) and society, between individual and nation. In this concept of society, of a humanly organized one the organically blood-linked bond is included for us through character values and ideals. Out of this fundamental outlook has grown an entire new system of ideas and State based on the recognition that it is not an abstract individualism, abstract universalism or abstract socialism falling down out of the clouds, so to speak, which forms people, but conversely, that healthy, blood-conditioned peoples do not recognize individualism or universalism as a measuring rod. Individualism and universalism are, regarded fundamentally and historically, the world outlooks of decadence; in the best cases they create an unfortunate man who is split apart by certain circumstances and who flees to a last rigid dogma in order to escape from an internal collapse.

From this entire experience of a new birth, from the recognition of primal eternal values and from the new version of the organic contrasts there suddenly emerges for us a radiant bright light. We find this if we survey the development of the last historical epochs. We see, if this important point is singled out again, two great movements—nationalism and socialism—struggling with one another through the entire 19th century into the 20th.

The fact is that at the basis of both of them there is an organically healthy core. This organically healthy drive necessarily lies, completely irrespective of what men and system may have gained, in the mastery of these forces will and the dispositions of thought during the course of time. We see the old German Nationalism after its upsurge in the Wars of Liberation—after its deepest foundation through Fichte, and its explosive appearance through Blucher, Freiherrn von Stein and Ernest Moritz Arndt and embodied in its military power by Scharnhorst and Gneisenau—pass over into the hands of an inwardly outlived but organizationally still strong generation such as was represented most acutely of all by the Metternich system. The flourishing, upward surge of nationalism thus passed immediately after its origin into a fateful bond with dynasticism.

The value of the king or kaiser as an institution had stood higher than the entire people. We see a court economy become great which would earlier had to have collapsed if the powerful strength of Bismarck had not undertaken to weld together monarchy and nation into a block under a dynastic leadership. But while King Frederick the Great embodied this unity even in the gravest days of destiny, his successor, Kaiser Wilhelm II, had already lost this faith when he declared that he wished to spare his people a civil war and crossed over the frontier. As a result, he released the dynastic concept from the *Volk*-totality and, on November 9th, 1918, the dynastic ideas of state collapsed. Soon all conscious German Nationalist circles came to realize the days of kingship were over.

German Nationalism of the 19th century was also closely linked with liberal democracy. The strength of that system increased with the growth of industrial trusts, more world trade, the wholesalers and the world banks. The economic interests of these trusts were frequently represented as national interests. Thus, for example, the Deutsche Bank and its profits in Turkey were falsely presented as *Volk* interests of the German Reich, During the war we concluded that the war effort of the nation, which had been spearheaded by the cry that the ground and soil which had been conquered by the German *Volk* army should now become German possession, had been betrayed. For many years there had been talk about the ore mines of Briey and Longwy. The interests of industry and profit were places above the interests of the entire nation. Today, German Nationalism dies from this unnatural union. It had stood order and rank on its head. Only a new vitality can create a new nationalism. It must link itself consciously and unconsciously with all previous Germanic struggles for freedom, and, above all, with the unconditional greatness of those men who, in 1813, led Germany out of the depths.

In exactly the same way as the nationalism of the 19th century was poisoned by Marxist-Liberal forces, so has this also been the case with socialism. We established, in the preceding passages, that socialism is a measure of state carried through for the protection of the entire people from all exploitation, and further, it offers a measure of state protection of the individual from private lust for profit. However, here it is not only a matter of a formal action in itself. An act becomes socialistic only in relation to its outward effect. For this reason it is possible that a socialistic action does not bring with it, as was likewise established, a formal state nationalization, as it can, on the contrary, even signify a personification, a liberation of individual forces if this liberation brings with it a strengthening of the totality.

When Bismarck was attacked from the conservative side as a "socialist," he declared that the concept of socialism did not terrify him in certain circumstances. He socialized the railways and he recalled the act of emancipation of the peasants by Reichsfreiherr von Stein, which likewise represented a socialistic measure. Here, our own view is in the deepest accord with that of Bismarck. The act of the Reichfreiherr von Stein signified the liberation of hundreds of thousands of peasants from a monstrously oppressive rule. Through this liberation of the creative forces, the welfare and character of the people were elevated. This act by the Reichsfreiherr von Stein remains until today one of the greatest milestones in the history of German socialist freedom.

Our new idea places *Volk* and race higher than the existing state and its forms. It declares protection of the people to be more important than protection of a religious creed, a class, of the monarchy or the republic. It sees in betrayal of the people a greater betrayal than high treason. As a result, the German renewal movement lays claim to the same freedom as Rome when confronting the formal state. It sees the opponent "of the state" who, suffering for his people and their honor, goes to prison and jail, not as a criminal but at a nobleman. It recognizes no inner obligation toward a structure. No struggle is "illegal" for us if it proceeds against the members of a doctrine politically falsifying true religion, which could proclaim betrayal of the country as its fundamental "faith." An unjust struggle is a struggle against *Volksgenossen*. Deadly enemies of a German people and of a coming German state are therefore those forces which make religious creed or class into a declaration of war on fellow members of the German people.

A retreat from or a struggle against the State in itself can, occasionally, bear a justified 'anti-national' stamp when it is in fact led by masterful

race-conscious characters and not by slavish natures under whom the rights to ownership of the soil has been preempted. We witnessed this for 14 years, when the moneyed democratic rabble, after the expropriation of mobile property, also stretched out its hand against immovable property and indirectly robbed farmers and estate owners through mortages, market anarchy, etc. Bismarck once said that a state which took away his property from him was no longer his fatherland. This was the assertion of a master. Motivated by similar feelings, Germans robbed of soil, migrated to all parts of the world to acquire property. The ultimate turning away from the ancient homeland which occurred rested on the new bond with property acquired by struggle. But the cry 'property is theft' was the battle cry of an uncreative slavish nature. It was no wonder that the Syrian Marx took up this cry and placed it at the head of his desolate teaching. However, everywhere that Marxism became dominant, it was unmasked as false. The greed for property has appeared particularly with its extremists. Therefore, in face of the earlier theft from the people the battle cry for all proletarians ran: "Creation of new property, struggle for new living space."

The new Reich requires from each German in public life not an oath to a state form but an oath to recognize German national honor according to his power and capacity. This honor must become the supreme value for each German. If an official cannot provide such an oath, then he necessarily loses all rights to occupy a public post. This right of citizenship, which hitherto everyone received as a gift upon his 21st birthday, must be acquired by effort in a new state—an idea which the National Socialist program already represents. Citizenship can be acquired through blameless conduct in educational institutions and in practical life. A German who offends the honor of the nation abandons his claim to receive rights of any kind from this people. Men who for reasons of conflict of conscience are unable to make an oath to the German people will not be persecuted by the State. But it is self-evident that as a result, they must lose any claim to the rights of state citizenship. Therefore, they may not become teachers, preachers, judges, soldiers, etc.

The liberal ideology—as a consequence of its *Volk*-hostile absence of barriers—introduced the idea that by the doctrine of freedom of mind and the doctrine of equal rights for all, activity of a political and instructive nature was interpreted completely without any relation to a shaping center. Therefore equal rights were allowed not only to a fighter against the state form but, beyond this, to an agitator against the *Volkdom*. The latter had the same rights as one who had risked his life a hundred times in the

trenches. The intellectualizing liberal bastard even regarded it as particularly "humane" to cultivate international "world ideas" while arrogantly deriding every expression of the rights of his own people. It is self-evident that chaos must follow.

It is also self-evident that there will always be and must exist very different personalities and groups within a people. A people of "brothers" is utopian and not at all beautiful. Complete brotherhood signifies the levelling out of all grades of value, of all tensions, of all dynamics of life. Struggle remains the life-producing spark. But all these ideals should be reflected within one ideal. They must be tested as to their value on a measure of value, namely, to ascertain if the ideas preached and the measures demanded are suited to ennoble and to strengthen the German *Volkhood*, to strengthen the race, to elevate the consciousness of the nation's honor. Political parties, which base their activity upon international class solidarity or international church interests, can be strengthened, but they have no justification in a German state. The activity of such *Volk*-hostile parties in the past as well as in the present has eaten away at and lacerated the soul of Germans. On the one side, the adherents of Marxism and of the Center still remained German, while on the other, they had to recognize values found outside of Germany as their highest values. The problem of the coming Reich as fulfillment of a German longing thus consists in preaching a new *Weltanschauung* to these tormented, falsely-led millions, to present to them—on the basis of this new mythos—a new supreme value.

The new world view will purify the value of the *Volkhood* and national honor which have slept within the dross of centuries. The new idea will accept the whole of life in its symbol. Only when this has occurred can a German Reich arise. Otherwise, all promises are empty.

The state apparatus can only carry through its work of typifying of the people in an imperfect manner. State laws can only be of a rounding-off or restricting, not of a vital, nature. The state can and must, for example, suppress a Bolshevist Fatherlandless party. But it can only do that in the long run if a strong life-renewing will and creative social labor stand behind it. A consciously built-up league of men will have to carry through this work.

Since 1933 we have known with what aid of what forces the un-State of November, 1918 has been replaced by a German one. We have known for years the man who would raise high a new banner on the towers of German cities. We know, and today finally experience, the powers of the race soul awaken from deep sleep, which this man had to carry by neces-

sity. It is the task of this founder of the new State to shape a league of men, let us say, a German Order, which is composed of personalities who have had a leading participation in the renewal of the German people.

The members of this "German Order" will be appointed by the first head of state after the foundation of the new Reich, from all strata of the people. A precondition of this are achievements in the service of the *Volkdom*, irrespective of domain. The council of the appointed Order will, in this manner, be replenished by new appointments upon the death of a member. The supreme head of the State—President, Kaiser or King (we say the Fuhrer) determines his successor for the ruling council of the Order. In this technical aspect a pattern is provided by the organization of the Roman church as a continuation of the ancient Nordic Roman Senate. As a result, on the one side, the *Volk*-serving forces of the council of the Order rise from all strata of the nation, upward by way of city and district associations, in each case conditioned through outstanding personal achievements. The connection between *Volk* and leadership thus remains preserved. A caste-like apartness, such as appeared after 1871, will be avoided. On the other side, however, the boundless democracy and demagogy which are always linked with it will be removed and replaced by the Council of the best.

Admittedly, a hereditary monarchy occasions the wearer of the crown to balance, even out of self-interest, the interests of the people to his home policy. Nevertheless, the danger of the decay of a dynasty remains in every generation. As a result, a kind of Byzantinism would appear, without the office of king being represented in a dignified way. As a consequence of these conditions there ensues the opposite of consistency in state life. This, of course, was always the goal of a hereditary monarchy. The degeneration of the monarchy brings unrest and revolution.

Today the people can only rarely see a great man directly. To achieve this catastrophes are necessary. Following a crisis, one breaks out of a shell and struggles forth. Therefore in ordinary life, the choice of President or King, as chosen directly by 70 million, is only determined by money bags. It follows from this that in 99 out of 100 cases no real *Volksfuhrer* arrives at the head. Therefore, in the coming first German *Volk* State, there must finally be a break with this deceitful democratic demand. Democracy spawns only as a tool of capitalism and the monied classes.

It also follows that a true parliamentary government may come into existence through the intoxication of the masses. Such is the case in the

immoral Democratic parliamentary systems. Beyond the borders of the village community, of the medium-sized town, the average man loses sight of any measuring rod for his judgements. It is self-evident that he is then able to evaluate a personality as to its value only if he is in a position to judge the latter's effect on the spot. This is impossible where party groups influence the elections of mostly unknown men. It therefore follows that in democracies, party lists, not personalities, are decisive in the elections.

For this reason in a German Reich of the kind we long for, the present form of election must gradually give way to the principle of appointment of responsible leaders through the Fuhrer by *Volk* and State. Those appointed to the highest posts will then appoint those in the lesser posts. As a result every group will be considered in relationship to the whole in the manner appropriate to it. In this respect, freely creative activity can appear and be provided for without divisive separatist outbreaks.

The *Wehrmacht* must be given special consideration in this total structure. It must admittedly hold itself aloof from all party political conflicts but its political alienation, such as capitalist and democratic journalists strove for, must cease once and for all in the coming Reich. The army is not there merely to be pushed wordlessly into the battlefield. Also it was not created so that it could be betrayed and disarmed by cowardly Pacifist Democrats who operate in name of 'the State.' The frightful experiences of the world war stand before us here as an admonishing example for all times. They must never be repeated again. This has been ensured through the successful personal union of Fuhrer, Reich Chancellor and Supreme Commander of the *Wehrmacht*.

Bismarck described the secret ballot as un-Germanic. So it is. Through this anonymity the cowardice of the individual is recognized as a mode of thought. Among other things, the feelings of responsibility is deliberately undermined. Applied to an entire people, it signifies the cultivation of spiritual vagabondage. Human feelings, however, will be unavoidable even in the best state. A rejected candidate will only too easily hold as an enemy anyone who rejects him out of purely objective reasons. Such would be unsuitable and bring about many undersirable difficulties as a consequence. It is something different when it is not a matter of the usual elections but of great questions of destiny affecting every German. Here there will not be an appeal to impossible judgements in individual technical matters but to the instincts, to the *Volk* character itself. In such cases the Fuhrer has, after 1933, already frequently called up this now

awakened will to self-preservation. These pronouncements have also given him further strength.

The future Germany must reveal in what form this grave problem of the connection between authority and the will of the *Volk* can henceforth be handled. See, in this connection, my address, "*Der deutsche Ordensstaat*," in *Blut und Ehre* (Munich, 1934).

Under the sign of the old parliamentarism every individual member was less responsible for his actions and behavior than an absolute monarch. A parliamentary cabinet referred in its decisions to the celebrated principle of "majority government." If a political program is successful, then the parliamentary minister is a "great man." If it fails, then the minister concerned, at least in the most extreme cases, withdraws without having to be held responsible. This fact encourages the most unscrupulous parliamentarians in accordance with their nature to recommend themselves anew as ministers. This would not be the case if any real responsibility existed as is presupposed as self-evident with an army leader. The parliamentary minority cultivated through this honorless system naturally describes this condition as an expression of the familiar progressive spirit. In reality, it is a shabby, bestial product of the cowardice of the majority which wishes to insolently sit in judgement over each and all, but which crawls irresponsibly behind the mass of parliamentary members. The parliamentarian is not even to be called to give an account before his electors. He is elected 'by the entire people,' as the language of the democratic-Marxist swindler runs. Thus, a firmly outlined circle of electors is not legally established. These things would change if the ministers at fault could be called to account by the head of the Reich before a political court in the same way as a defeated general before a court martial. Then ministerial rivalry would become significantly rarer, and only really responsible men would strive for those positions. Under the democracy of 1918 even the most ordinary subjects could squint with the fullest prospects of success and non-punishments for failures and betrayals.

These thought processes have as a goal the conquest of a dogma. Such dogma is today worshipped by all like a golden calf. This dogma is the unrestricted freedom of movement. Today, one sees a *Volk*-murdering stream flowing away from the land and the rural areas to the great cities. The latter swell in size, unnerve the *Volkdom*, destroy the threads which link men with Nature, entice adventurers and business speculators of all shades and promote racial chaos. From the city, as center of a civilization, a system of advanced posts for Bolshevist decline has grown within the

world cities. Unnatural, willess cowardly 'intellectuality' links itself with the brutal, typeless rebellious fury of bastardized slaves. The enslaved who are still of good race and folk strata fight on false fronts—led by Marxism—for their freedom.

Spengler prophesied cities with 20 million inhabitants and an impoverished countryside. Such was to be our fate. Rathenau described stony deserts and the 'wretched inhabitants' of German cities as the future, who would provide mercenary services for powerful foreign countries. The motivations of these men were certainly different. But together they inculcate into the German people the idea of the impossibility of change. 'Subject to destiny,' this is the name of the new expression for weakness of will or cowardice; but it has even become the words of solution from those political criminals who wish to manoeuvre our people into the misery of a Fellahin-like final condition! This is ensured according to plan by the press of international Marxism. These Reds unite a willess herd of millions behind them as the faithful retinue, as a mass ready for revolution. Weak-willed philosophers thus provide the enemies of the people with the 'ideological' foundation, in order to perfect a long-prepared work of destruction. That Spengler, in spite of this, preached power, power, power, merely shows a lack of logic.

At bottom of all these oracular cries about the 'irreversibility of development' lies the un-German, coercive dogma of unrestricted freedom of movement as a 'guarantee of personal freedom.' But this apparently unshakeable doctrine is a problem of will. The rejection in principle of the 'right' to freedom of movement signifies a prerequisite for our entire future life. it must therefore be established even if such a claim to power is felt by millions at first to be a grave 'damaging of personality.' There reamins only one choice. One must perish miserably on the asphalt, or he must seek to regain health on the land or in a medium-sized city. This choice has already been made in the sense of elimination of freedom of movement. At first there will be considerable resistance in the hearts of many.

All joint stock companies, cartels, etc., need not be concentrated in two or three cities. They need not take over the entire apparatus of government. It is not true that more and more new factories "must arise in Berlin in order to tie new hundreds of thousands there." It is false that supply and demand, as is often said, "must" rule life. The task of a real *Volkish* state consists in directing the values and establishing an order of forces that are today controlled by others.

The capital city with its glitter, its cinemas and stores, its stock exchange, and its night cafes, hypnotizes the land. Under the sign of freedom of movement the best blood streams unhindered into the blood-poisoning capital city. Our farmers seek work. They found businesses. They earn cash beyond their dreams. The mania of immigration reinforces anew. This disastrous cycle can only be solved by a strictly handled blocking of increases in population.

Salvation does not lie in the building of dwellings in the capital city for which there is so great a call. This actually promotes decline. We find salvation in the elimination of the liberal *Volk*-destructive freedom of movement. Immigration without approval into cities of over a hundred thousand inhabitants must be unconditionally banned in the future. Money for new dwellings can only be approved in urgent cases for such cities. This money is best distributed instead among the smaller towns. New factories may then be erected in cities of approximately a hundred thousand inhabitants if the object of exploitation lies on the spot, e.g., newly discovered coal stocks, salt deposits, etc. Present day transport possibilities shape the distribution of forces. Decentralization must occur in the whole of economic life. Not only will it not damage our economy but it will strengthen it. This can be accomplished through our racial strength and *Volk* health alone. We can succeed by applying our most important capital which we possess generally.

In the United States, the concentration of capital has proceeded at a most rapid tempo. Giant grain mills and mammoth slaughter houses to which raw materials stream from over the whole land overburden the railway network. Freight costs increase the price of ready-made goods. These problems could have been avoided by the erection of fewer large centers from the start.

Ford, for example, rightly demanded that cotton mills should not be built in the capital cities but laid out in the neighborhood of the cotton fields themselves. An unrestricted development of human freedom of movement and of storage of goods defeats in its own object. The protests increase which, without yet risking change to the insane dogma of freedom of movement, nevertheless soberly recognize the natural necessity of decentralization. Out of purely economic reflections they arrived at the same conclusions that I do from the idea of racial protection.

The farmer who is still the greatest producer today is not simultaneously the greatest purchaser. He is dependent on those intermediary stages which process his products before they arrive on the market. He cannot change them on the spot into ready goods but must burden the

transport system with raw materials. This fateful development attempts to uproot the farmer stock, the strongest support of every people, a stock that "never dies" (Chamberlain). This trend has been consciously protected by democracy and by Marxism in order to enlarge in this way the proletarian host. A true *Volk* policy must proceed in exactly the opposite way. The de-proletarianization of our nation—and of every other—is conceivable only through the conscious demolition of our great cities and the foundation of new centers. To speak of bringing a sedentary life and nationalization in the midst of giant heaps of stone, is insanity.

An unusual American idea, 'salvation' with the aid of the automobile, has been attempted in the U.S.A. It manages only to squander power and lose time. The millions who daily travel into New York from outside and who are spewed out again in the evening, overload transport and make the whole of life more expensive than would have been the case through a strict damming up and guiding of the human flood. In place of perhaps a hundred large *Volk*-poisoning centers, ten thousand culture-promoting ones could be created if strong-willed heads had determined our destiny instead of Marxism and Liberalism.

In terms of draftsmanship, our life proceeds today upon only one line: backward and forward. In the future it must rotate around organically established center points. If the number of inhabitants of a city approaches the figure of a hundred thousand, then an outlet must be looked for. New settlers must be directed to smaller places or settled upon the land. They must not be permitted to live in the cellars of our cities as democracy encourages.

It must not be assumed that we are still left with choices. One needs only to look at the troubles of New York which touch upon the very vital nerves to know at once that all is at stake. In order to control the ever-increasing traffic a giant staff of architects and technicians are working day and night. Things have now gone so far that the erection of multilevel streets has been proposed. Roads for cars have to be laid under the houses and pedestrian stairways arranged above these in passages. Bridges must span one side of the street to another. An entire complex of stairs, passageways and permanently artificially lighted thoroughfares, is planned. The new American three-zone law allows a higher development of houses. New designs surpass anything known before, as we see in the work of architects like H. Ferris, R. Hood, M. Rusell and Crosell. The aim of all these technical efforts, which reveal perfect freedom of movement as the foundation of their *Weltanschauung*, is a heap of mammoth stone pyramids in which all human life must become desolate, rigid and must

finally perish. Such a foundation for a *Weltanschauung* must be cleared away. Only then will the path be clear for the surpassing of technology through technology itself. The great city created ease of transport. It must die from this ease of movement if we do not wish to perish racially and spiritually. The *Polis* created Greek culture. The small town, the middle-sized city made every *Volkish* civilisation in Europe. The expanding vision of the former individual peasant grasped the idea of a state, without losing itself into infinity. In this alone could an organic cultural structure arise.

The ease of communication, the press, if decently directed, the radio and personal observation, make possible to every grown-up today the judgement of the things of a city, provided that the number of inhabitants does not go much beyond a hundred thousand. The citizen is in a position to correct reports coming from outside through his own observations. The activity of communal politicians in relation to the good of the State must correspond to the daily concerns of the industrial worker and to the worker in all professions. The way also stands open for the real judgement of achievements. In such communal elections we create the possibility of a preliminary election. Broad masses of the people can choose among personalities and need not rely upon lists. Candidates will be proposed by guilds, associations and by the German Order through its local representives. As a result, the electors of parliament will rest upon a broad *Volkish* foundation, not upon a nameless mass. The voting rights of women will also remain in communal elections. A *Volk*-will, adapted to visible personalities and coming from below, will thus meet the ruling will from above. Absolute monarchy knew only the direction from above to below. Chaotic democracy only knew mass stagnation from below. The German city of the future, realized through the act of power of individuals, will not subject the type-creating personalities to any election mood and moneyed deceit. It will maintain them under the state director in power and it will renew them again and again through education, bringing them German Order. Through the election process outlined, an unhindered method of advancement will be offered to creative personalities. The coming Reich is thus, as elaborated, Nationalist and Socialist. It means that it is not founded on mere votes, but on type-welding passion and racially-linked mankind. Nationalism in the most passionate form is the prerequiste and final goal of action. Socialism is state safeguarding of the individual under the mark of recognition of his individual honor and in favor of racial protection.

Restrictions have to be made in order to overcome the *Volk*-murdering captial city. Simultaneously, efforts must be made to abolish the city in itself in order to divide up Germany into small cities and towns. There are those who would have no cities larger than 12,000 inhabitants. Those who hold for such an enticing view are poor students of history. This is a visionless, if principled, position. In order to become a totality, eighty million people need nodal points of life, large enough to provide many strong personalities with sufficient intellectual air to breathe, but also sufficiently restricted in shaping as not to perish in the chaos of the many millions who are concentrated together and yet splintered. Culture only forms itself in the town; only the town can provide a focal point of conscious national life, collect existing energies, adapting to the whole and making that political world vision possible which Germany in particular, open as a State to so many directions, needs more than all others. Several centres up to 500,000 and many up to 100,000 are thus a spiritual necessity. It is quite possible to go too far in pursuit of reasonable decentralization.

Completely apart from the conscious renunciation of liberal "freedom," it is the compulsive military-political situation itself which compels us to abandon the large cities. Future wars will be strongly determined by air fleets. The aim of gas and fire bombs will always be the great cities. The more scattered factories and cities the less the danger of damage from air attacks. Destiny compels today, as in earlier times, that the entire people must take part in battle, or its existence. Earlier, the lord in his castle built a wall around his citizens' houses and the inhabitants which as a totality had to participate in all battles. The liberal epoch trained professional armies. The burghers were defended by the soldiers although, at the same time, they arrogantly cursed militarism. This false idyll is over. Technology which had once drawn a steel wall around an entire State, has broken through again and restored the age-old organic relationship between people and war. As a result, *Weltanschauung* and destiny commend in common the demolition of the great cities and the erection of towns and roads according to strategic viewpoints. If in the past castles were defiantly built upon mountain heights, today everything important must be concealed under the earth in concrete casements. An entire city of skyscrapers becomes insanity. This recognition will also compel definite State-architectural conclusions.

Those are some basic outlines of the new state-political systems, as they result of themselves from the supreme values of our people. Other

measures which are beyond the scope of this book and which are of a purely technical nature are dictated by these considerations.

Future generations will consider it insane that the state could be regarded as an arena for unplanned movement of peoples. By the same token, we will just as all others regard the demands of political liberalism as insane.

None of us knows if the coming Reich will adorn itself in the garb of Kaiserism, of kingship or of a republic. We cannot sense in advance all the individual features of this future form. The old Imperial crowns have rolled in the dust. The Republic arose from actions of which Germans will be ashamed for a thousand years. Only the ancient Germanic idea of kingship has—so it appears—preserved its mythic glitter through to the present. It formed the organic backbone at a time when the Roman Emperorship expanded boundlessly all over the world. It formed the basis of the new Reich founded in 1871. Kindred feeling still cultivates its idea even today. The 23 dynasties have fallen; they cannot return unless Germany is to fall anew into fearful internal discord. The *Lander* must close their own parliaments (*Landtage*) and each one broaden its honorable ideas of dynastic royalty. The idea of Imperium adheres to the old Imperial concept. Pomp and power are its sole content. The idea of a king is more inward, earth-linked. The simple Bavarian thinks of his king in just as lively a manner as the true Prussian. The "Kaiser" was for the people an abstraction who held office by "God's Grace." We are more than sick of the operetta-like behavior of the times prior to 1914; but we are really disgusted at the spiritual improverishment, linked with the fawning upstarts of democracy. In fact, we wish to see in a German king a man like ourselves who is also the embodiment of an heroic mythos. Just as in place of the glittering spiked helmet, the grey steel helmet appeared in the storm of battles, so will the future also find the form of a German National Socialist *Volk* leadership through the birth of a State based upon order of rank as the embodied longing of the present generation for the coming Reich, as fulfilment of the sacrifice of those two millions who gave their lives for Germany.

From the one demand to place the *Volk* honor and racial protection into the center of organic State life, a world picture results which differs from the chaos of the 19th century like day from night. From the dishonorable trader ideal arose the blood red world war, world revolts, followed by the vilest blood-sucking of the peoples. The 19th century gave birth to Bolshevism as its fullest fruit, the most devastating pestilence of Oriental spirit since the Inquisition spread its poisonous clouds over Europe. From

the one inner transformation the dream vision of a new State arises clearly drawn in all its great outlines. Already millions today experience a new longing for type and law, earth-linked and borne by honor. The way is clear. To draw a clear track is the task of eternal pulsating, progressive life. Master Eckehart said: "It is the deepest wells which carry the highest water." In 1918 the German people through its own guilt fell into the deepest abysses and for the length of fifteen years was punished and tortured by its internal and external enemies in a most undignified manner. Nevertheless forces have been rediscovered which arrived from the depths of life. Newly discovered here, the eternal primal wellsprings of the German peoples find strength. And now, ready for battle, they carry these experiences and perceptions through the misery of the time. What the 19th century in bourgeois avariciousness, criminal Marxist insanity and broadest lack of ideas violated, the present 20th century has to make good again in the midst of a hostile world, such as Germany has never before faced in such concentrated power.

Therefore the new teaching of life is no soft sermon, but a hard and austere demand, for we know that the doctrine of humanity attempted to counteract the natural process of selection and that Nature, as a result, avenged herself, so that it will one day smash to pieces all these democratic and other attempts. The essence of German renewal therefore consists in fitting oneself into the eternal, natural, aristocratic laws of the blood and not in the promotion of the selection of the weak. On the contrary, through the practice of conscious selection guided by the strength of will, we can produce what is creative. We can do this without looking back at what remains behind.

Today, we seek in looking over the German past—for example, if we walk through Dinkelsbuhl or Rothenburg—a self-contained picture of Germanic culture which appears before us. It is a picture of unequalled creative strength and defensive capacity. We know that the Thirty Years War destroyed a feeling of life forever. The 17th and 18th centuries lie in between like deep abysses. Only with the strengthening of the Prussian State has a completely new life begun to arrive again. In the wars of liberation of 1813 and in its men we saw the concept arise of a new German who shaped life. We men of today link ourselves to the leaders of this war of liberation, to the first founders of a new idea of State and to a new feeling of life.

We think of the great Freiherrn von Stein, who recognized only one fatherland whose name was Germany. It was he who declared:

> At this moment of great development, we are completely indifferent to dynasties. They are merely tools. It is my wish that Germany become great and strong, in order to again obtain its independence and nationality and to assert both of these in its position between France and Russia. Old, collapsed and rotten forms cannot be preserved on the way.

IV. Nordic-German Law

With the falsification of the honor-conscious Nordic idea of law by Roman-Syrian influences, we find one of the greatest causes of world discord. The purely private-capitalistic Roman idea, 'sanctified,' in the hands of unrestricted state idolatry, irrespective of whether embodied through monarchy or republic, is the crusade of robbery by a small human group. These men were skilled in slipping through the meshes of a purely formal conformity to a code of law. Intellectual desolation was a result necessarily highly cultivated and the law protected it. A sullen protest from oppressed millions was falsified through Marxism. However, it was more than justified because of the existing disregard for all German concepts of law. For this the state and church bore equal guilt. Because it possessed absolute power, 'the state' passed so-called social laws. However, this was not done in the name of *Volk* honor, of justice and duty, it was given as a gift from above, from renowned 'Christian' love, grace, from pity and mercy. This was neither good nor just. However, many who blissfully gaze back at pre-war times wish to assert this to us. It was, in fact, far more the continued rejection of our *Volkdom*. Such was the basic principle of all varieties of Liberalism.

What the liberalizing monarchs had begun was completed by Marxism in all its shades. Despite its apparent struggles against capitalist democracy, Marxism nevertheless originated from the same materialistic

outlook on the world as Liberalism. Never before has such a dishonorable law reigned in such a way as when money in itself became an unrestricted ruler. "Law" arose, disregarding its metaphysical anchoring, everywhere from self-help. At first it emerged as a naked struggle for possibilities of existence. Then it appeared as a preservation of outward freedom. Then it became a source of fixed character values. The attack on the honor of the individual became the starting-point of a legally recognized, personal defense. This self-help was then extended to the preservation of the interests and honor of the clan. Only gradually did greater unions appear such as Church and State. Self-help was placed in the service of the community as embodied in bishops or kings in universal courts. According to its Germanic interpretation this intervention into individual life only has justification in so far as it represents a protection of honor. The church has rejected this primal idea of the Nordic West or only recognized it partially and unwillingly. Today, our valid laws recognize only the so called "preservation of justified interests." It is a matter of indifference whether these interests are of an honorable or disreputable kind. A natural step from the protection of the honor of the individual to protection of the clan would have been the announcement of the protection of the honor of the people. But here we stand before a truly frightful allegory of decay of character. It began long ago but only today has it become so openly public. In the whole of "German" law there was not a single rule among thousands which made insults to our honor a punishable offence. Thus the name and respect of the German people could be insulted by all who wish to do so. Berlin Jews called the "Germania"—the symbol of Germany—a whore, the entire *Volk* the "eternal Boche," and all of us a nation of "official corpses, voting cattle and murderers". . .No State attorney before 1933 lifted so much as a little finger to prosecute these people. On the contrary, men who expose these Jews as scoundrels were ruthlessly punished on account of the insult to the Jews.

From this state of affairs emerged everything that was grotesque and insane. These are the characteristics in which our time is so rich. Notorious traitors were not punished with severe jail sentences, not even with imprisonment. At the worst, they were given honorary detention. The pacifist mentality was openly cited by German courts as a grounds for clemency. Meanwhile men, who were covered with a hundred wounds and who had endured times of hard battles, were condemned to death as "Feme murderers" or given lifelong imprisonment. The destroyer of the *Volk* was thus granted all honor and the fighter for the *Volk* was hunted to

be robbed of all honor. A soulless "Justice" can arrive at such fearful results because it lacks every measuring rod in relation to the interest and honor of the people.

A Germanic interpretation of law has granted every member of the people the right to express with word and deed the honor of the nation. We also permit self-help action if circumstances do not allow for the operation of the courts. To favor national traitors of pacifist outlook as grounds for clemency means to declare the coward to have equal rights with the brave man. It is therefore only too justified to make the following demand:

> Every German and non-German living in Germany, who through word, writing and action makes himself guilty of insulting the German people will, depending upon the gravity of the case, be punished with imprisonment, jail, or death.
>
> A German, who commits the aforementioned offense outside the Reich boundaries, shall, in the event that he does not place himself before the German court, be declared to be without honor. He shall lose all rights of State citizenship. He will be expelled from the country forever and declared under banishment. His property will be confiscated in favor of the State.

In the treatment of an idea of law lies perhaps the strongest type-forming but also type-destroying power. If outlooks of a philosophical or religious nature are often remote from life, then daily existence demands continous practical cultivation of the regulating law. The civic conduct and the style of thinking will be determined, formed or disintegrated always according to a supreme value of a people, a State or of another representation of law. The idea of honor and loyalty was the basic feature of Germanic-Nordic law which has also always been operative outside Germany as *Volk*-and State-building. The idea of Roman law safeguarded the character of capitalistic times. It was adapted to what was personal. The honorless charcater of Jewry, embodied in the Talmud and in Schulchan-Aruch, always formed the disintegrating element wherever the Jew could become "a legal representative." The fact remains that, among "our" lawyers, an enormous number of Jews was at work. In fact, they operated "successfully," and that alone proves to every deep thinking person that we had been robbed of German law.

* * *

I have alluded from the beginning to the knightly concept of honor. It confronts us in all legal documents of Germanic men through all times as the eternal mythos of the Nordic race soul. The capacity to sacrifice his life for the idea of honor, is regarded by the Icelandic Sagas as the essence of the Nordic man. This spiritual property was protected despite the sacrifice of all other possessions. At first honor was held by each personally. Then, it was embodied in the community as embodied in the judge, and this likewise was grounded in the concept of honor. "It is better to protect freedom with weapons, than to stain it through payment of taxes," reported Paulus Diakonus concerning the views of Langobard kings. The dignified *Sachsenspiegel* declared: "Good without honor cannot be regarded as a good, and a body without honor, one is rightly accustomed to hold for dead." According to Germanic concepts, "only that man possessing 'law' has unassailable honor." After 1918 the man who possessed most money had "law" even if he was a scoundrel. "Other *Volk*, which take goods for honor," were regarded as unfit for civic offices according to the city law of St. Polten. "Guilds must be as pure as if they were chosen by doves," asserted craftsmen from the German past. "Thus all honor comes from loyalty," so says the *Sachsenspiegel*. We listen also to Schiller's words about the unworthiness of a nation which does not stake its all upon its honor. These are but identical expressions. The same soul had a creative influence upon our life for thousands of years until with an alien, still not re-shaped, religion came on us. The alien ideas of the Roman State and its alien law also destroyed this life.

The Imperial *Volk*-alien doctors transplanted alien law and dishonorable ideas into the Germanic tribes. They operated as mere bailiffs for the powers of the ruling church and the Roman State. Geyler von Kaisersberg complained about the "tongues of tittle-tattlers" who, with their gossip, were "completely harmful to the common good," and who were concerned only with their own advantages. In the year 1513 a poem appeared, the *Welschgattung* (Marriage with a Foreigner), which completely consciously attributes the loss of German freedom to the Roman law. Ulrich von Hutten alludes in his conversation in *Die Rauber* to the Lower Saxons who made their way in their law without the new Doctors. Things had gone better in Germany he said, when the law resided in weapons, not in books. Thus the first and only German social revolution was fully justified according to its essence. This was the peasant revolt at the beginning of the 16th century against Roman slavery in its threefold

form as church, State and manipulation of law. Today, at the beginning of the 20th century, the spiritual-intellectual revolution has continued, until the final victory.

The falsification of ancient Germanic law in favor of the legal church and worldly tyrants was the cause of the social violence of the 15th century. The peasants, who made claim to their ancient rights, were sent back home. The claim by the *Bundschuh* that this servitude "was not in accordance with the will of God" bore as little fruit among the Roman prelates as among the Roman Doctors who were employed by the princes. So from the year 1432 the peasant revolt against Junkers and bishops began. It was also directed against the usurious money-lending Jews who fled into the cities under the protection of the episcopal crozier. In 1462 the archbishop of Salsburg instituted enormous taxes, and when the tormented people arose against him, Duke Ludwig von Bayern hurried to his aid to suppress the peasants. In 1476 the first "Socialist," Joann Behm, appeared and demanded expropriation of the Princes and Prelates. Behm wanted to assemble with a great host before Niklashausen. Before this could happen he was arrested, abducted and burnt in Wurzburg. It is remarkable that, parallel to these social battles, the mystical movement of the Begardes appeared. It had once been active in union with Meister Eckehart. Everywhere suppressed strata of our people rebelled against alien thought-forms, religious impoverishment and degenerate manipulation of law. The *Budschuh* and the Arme *Konrad*, in part led by the best knights including Florian Geyer, moved through the German lands. But the violence of the long withheld torrent was not to be controlled. Burning and plundering the wild hosts trod underfoot everything which came in their path. Luther, in order to keep his Reformation free of social struggles, placed himself on the side of princes in armour and as a result took away from the peasant movement its driving force for good. Thus the German peasant revolt, rolling along without great leaders, was suppressed. It had been moderate and was borne by the highest moral principles. It demanded much in its twelve principles which the present day program of renewal must also again demand. However, the manipulators of church and state listened just as little as they did in the 19th century, when a dishonorable world economy "justifiedly" enslaved millions.

Once the idea of social cooperation had a stronger effect than that of the Roman State. The Knights' order stood at the head of this social shaping power in the early Middle Ages. The trading society formed by these knights represented, put into our contemporary language, the first Ger-

man trade union. It was this "trade union" which held the entire Reich together, not the Roman Church. History has been deliberately falsified to show the contrary. After the Leagues of Knights followed the League of Cities, the guilds, the town and legal leagues and the leagues of Marches. This was the fullblooded German system of law. The first sign of the ossification of our life was when the Church law, the *corpus iuris canonici*, began to operate from the 13th century onward. It was renewed in particular during the world war, in 1917, and was declared to be fundamentally unalterable. This so-called "divine right" cannot be altered by any usage and any circumstances. Along with "divine" unalterable right there is alterable lower law. This is also approved by the Church. The *Volk* is a participant in this. "The people prays, serves, expiates." Divine right is the unrestricted rule of the People, the sanctified power of the Bishops and the Sacraments. Rome also sucks the last drop of honey out of the mythos of the representation of God.

If one recalls how fruitful and life-contributing ancient Germanic law once was, then one sees in the degeneration of the legal-creative powers of the German people just how great our fall has been.

In 643 the law of King Rotharis appeared and produced a number of flourishing colleges of law with their center in Pavid (Padua). The codes of law of the later city leagues of Lombardy and in Germany go back to this creation by the Lombards. The Franks, Alemanns etc., also carried on their wanderings their own racial versions of law. This law then displaced the ancient Roman law. The later disappearance of Frankish and Barvarian blood promoted the late-Roman law. The "great" French revolution signified the destruction of the Germanic constituents and interpretations of law. Since then "France," i.e. the land of the Franks, has been Jewish-Roman in its determination. England was created by Saxon law. Norman law shaped the foundation of the ancient Russian state. Germanic law created life and customs in the eastern settlements of the Knights Order, later the Hanseatic League. German cities' codices formed the communal system even in the Ukraine. Lubeck law ruled and cultivated Reval, Riga, Novgorod. Madgeburger law created the substructure of the Polish State; it was the binding-link which continued to be a type-forming effect when the Polish State disintegrated through the Counter-Reformation, approaching its decline.

* * *

For many centuries, we have debated whether the law is to be placed above politics or politics above law, i.e., whether morality or power ought

to predominate. As long as generations in action have existed, power politics rulership has always triumphed over unrestricted principles. But if in place of a shaping generation, one of drones and aesthetes guided an epoch, then the battle cry was always "the rights of peoples" and "moral principles." Behind these principles, however, nothing but extreme cowardice crawled. Even where this has not been the case as with Kant, the priority order for law and politics has been falsely placed. Hitherto these two concepts have been regarded as two self-existent, almost absolute unities and then always according to character and temperament judgements given concerning the desirable relationship between the two. On the other hand, we often forget that law and politics are not absolutes. They are only fixed by the actions of men of purposeful nature. Both ideas also refer, according to *Volkish* standards, to a principle that stands above both. This principle has to direct men inward as well as external affairs of state in life-structures, in the service of something higher.

An ancient Indian principle of law from prehistoric Nordic times runs: "Law and Unlaw do not walk around and say: We are this. Law is what Aryan men discover to be right." This is an allusion to a primordial wisdom forgotten in the present day that law is a blood related scheme. It is a system of religion and art. It is linked for eternity to a certain blood with which it appears and with which it passes away. Politics, in the best sense of what is really statesmanlike, signified external security for the purpose of strengthening of a *Volkdom*. The Law nowhere opposes this as it is understood in the right sense as "our Law." It must serve the ruling part within the entire structure of a *Volkdom*. As our humanists of art looked at Hellas as at something which represented an artistic model entirely on its own and not as organically shaped, so our Humanists also looked to Rome for a model of Law. They overlooked the fact that Roman Law was a product of the Roman people and could not be imitated by us because it related to supreme value other than our own. The social and military prototype of Rome gave birth as a counterpart to a purely individualistic interpretation of law. The *parter families* who presided over the life and death of members of his kindred is an allegory of Roman objectivity and impartiality. Thus, the concept of property taken to its ultimate conclusion. The Roman interpretation of law simulataneously declared holy the concept of individual capitalism. Economic man became the supreme value. It may defend its "justified interests" with all possible means without anyone asking if the honor of the people has suffered harm in establishing this economic egoism.

One may certainly not hold ancient Roman Law, which set its unwritten boundaries through the presiding prototypes, responsible for the late Roman bastard phenomena, which at all events possessed some racially identical Langobard wefts which the Roman State and the Roman Church presented us. This was done in order to "legally" complete the enslavement of free peoples. We have today attempted to take over the capitalist principle of law, although we cannot take over the whole of ancient Roman life. It can never really become alive again. It was torn from the beam supporting it as an organic State structure. It received another function and became even more an absolute measuring rod from a function. The subjective absence of control became a law. This fact has been veiled until today by formalities. "The Romans would have never increased the legacy of mankind by the idea of a law independent of and equal to the State, if they had not with powerful one-sidedness put into reality the opposite of the *ius singolum* and of the *ius populi*. Here the sovereignty of the one and indivisible State attorney, there the sovereignty of the individual; these were powerful levers of Roman legal history." (*Die soziale Aufgave des Privatrechts*" Berlin, 1889, p6.)

Thus R. Gierke described the form of Roman polarity of life. Unbridled economic-individualism conceives and applies "the law" without reference to race and *Volk*, since *Volk* honor is not the determining center. The paths to an economic goal are only judged from a formal-juristic aspect, not from the aspect of Nordic-German consciousness of honor.

Many who are horrified at these things which have today become openly evident now attempt to find salvation by calling for "independence of the law" from party, money and other forces. But in so doing they overlook that this so-called freedom is without relation to a shaping center and is to be held responsible for the present condition of lawlessness. This is because politics, as presently elaborated, was regarded as the method of carrying out so-called purely formal state authority. It is not regarded as an achievement to be used in the service of the people and its supreme value.

"The" Law and "the" state lay over us like other crusts, like "the" religion, "the" art and "the" science. Their hollow expression of power has called forth revolutionary forces. At first the forces of the desperate were repressed. As a result, today, the revolution of the Nordic-Germanic race soul is no longer robbed of its highest value.

That is the essential fact which has been clouded by legal compromises, such as, for example, the German civic law code. Only a few features of the ancient Germanic consciousness of law have remained.

If we link the conclusions from these admissions with what was elaborated at the beginning, then it results as seen at first from an internal State aspect that law and politics represent only two different expressions of the same will which stands in the service of our highest racial value. It is the first duty of a judge to protect the *Volk* honor through his pronouncements from every attack, and politics has the duty to carry through such a pronouncement ruthlessly. Conversely, politics—as law-giving and executive power—has the duty to pass only such laws which in a social, religious and generally moral-forming aspect serve the highest value of our people. Here the judge has the counseling voice.

The idols of the 19th century were trade and profit. All laws were related to this principle, all property became wares and all art goods for trading. Religion in the colonies and in the missions to "heathens" were tools for opium dealers, diamond racketers and plantation owners. In vain the national idea struggled against the dissipation of our racially intrinsic life. It was too weak, because it was not an all-embracing mythos, but was only held to be one value among others. For a long time there were no supreme values, only convenient aids to exploitation. Thus law also became the whore of economy, i.e., the profit-seeking of money which determined politics. The "German" democracy of November, 1918 signified the victory of the dirtiest racketeering idea which the world had ever seen. Therefore, if today we represent a law as it was sketched at the beginning, then this signifies a deliberate attack upon the essence of all present day democracies and their Marxist forerunners. It signifies the destruction of the idea of honor in favor of the dishonorable concept of capitalism. We demand the complete rule of what is *Volkish* over every form of internationalism. This idea must be uniformly served by everything which strives for predominance today: religion, politics, law, art, schools and social doctrine. From the demand for protection of the honor of the *Volk* there follows, as a most important measure, the protection of *Volk* and race.

This characterization of the highest spiritual value coincides exactly with the essence of the various transcriptions of the German concept of law. As Gierke says: "We cannot break with the great Germanic idea of the unity of law without abandoning our future." Bott-Bodenhausen asks whether one agrees with replacing the concept of being with the concept of effect, and the corporations with the functional and the dynamic. Everything nevertheless runs to placing the inner bonds between law and duty above goods and money. Against a rational method of individualization, this type of creation of law is a willed, morally binding activity.

The German does not attribute unhindered legal right to an object, i.e., a property to the owner. Rather, it thinks of the relation of the person to his property. Being rooted in an organic totality, the idea of duty, the vital reference is that all this characterizes the German concept of law and all this springs from a center of will. It keeps pure the idea of the protection of honor.

No people of Europe is racially homogeneous, not in even Germany. According to the latest research, we accept five races all of which reveal perceptibly different types. But it is beyond question that the true culture bearer for Europe has been in the first place the Nordic race. Great heroes, artists and founders of States have grown from this blood. It built the massive fortresses and sacred cathedrals. Nordic blood composed and created those works of music which we revere as our greatest revelations. Nordic blood shaped German life before all else. It is revealed in some circles only in small, but very definite type-forming, ways. Germany is Nordic and the Nordic element has had a type-forming effect also upon the Western, Dinaric and East-Baltic races. This singling out of the Nordic race does not signify any sowing of "race hatred in Germany." On the contrary, we have a conscious recognition of a full-blooded binding material within our *Volkhood*. Without this binding-material, as it has formed our history, Germany would never have become a German Reich. Germanic poetry would never have appeared. The idea of honor would never have dominated and ennobled law and life. On any day if the Nordic blood were to vanish without a trace, Germany would fall to pieces and undergo a characterless chaos. That many forces deliberately work for this has been extensively discussed. These forces find support in the Alpine type, which, without any value of its own, has remained fundamentally superstitious and slavish in disposition despite Germanization. The external bonds of the old Reich idea collapsed. This blood stirred together with other bastard pheomena. It placed itself in the service of a magical belief or in the service of the unconditional democratic chaos. It finds its protoganist in parasitical but instinctively strong Jewry.

If a German renewal attempts to realize the values of our soul in a vital sense, then it must also preserve and strengthen the physical prerequisites of these values. Race protection, race breeding and race hygiene are thus unavoidable requirements of a new time. Racial breeding signifies, above all, the protection of the Nordic racial component of our people in the sense of our deepest research. A German state has as its first duty the creation of laws. These must correspond to our basic requirements.

The Vatican has again made itself known as the bitterest enemy of the improved breeding of the biologically valuable, and as the protector of the preservation and propagation of the inferior. Even to serious Catholic eugenicists, Pope Pius declared—at the beginning of 1931 in his encyclical *Concerning Christian Marriage*—that it was not lawful to restrict men who were capable of entering into a marriage, but could only give life to inferior offspring; to in any way prevent propagation because of the inviolability of the body. The individual man has the right to use his own limbs. He must use them "corresponding to their natural purpose." This was revealed by reason and by the Catholic Christian moral doctrine, and the worldly authority never has the right to go beyond this. To set up unrestricted propagation of idiots, the children of syphilitics, alcoholics and the insane as a "Christian moral doctrine" is undoubtedly the height of a thinking that is hostile to nature and *Volk*. This has today been declared to be impossible by us. In reality, it represents nothing other than the necessary outflow of that racially chaotic system that Syrian-African-Roman dogma has forged. Therefore, every European who would like to see his people physically and spiritually healthy and who takes the stand that idiots and the incurably sick infect his nation, will have to permit himself to be represented, according to Roman teaching, as anti-Catholic, as an enemy of the Christian moral doctrine. And he will have to choose if he is the anti-Christ or if the Founder of Christianity can really have Himself conceived—as a dogma—the unrestricted breeding of all kinds of inferior types. This is what His "representative" boldly demands. Therefore, whoever wishes for a healthy and spiritually strong Germany must passionately reject this encyclical. Such is the work of a Pope who aims at the breeding of sub-humanity. We thus reject Roman thought as anti-natural and hostile to life.

Immigration into Germany, which was earlier restricted along religious lines, was later unrestricted. No feelings of or for Jewish "humanity" must in the future be carried out because of our Nordic-racial and hygienic views. For example, nothing will stand in the way of granting citizenship to Nordic Scandinavians, but insuperable difficulties must be placed in the way of migration of mulattoid elements from the South or East. Persons who are afflicted with hereditary diseases must be refused permanent residence or their capacity for reproduction must be restricted by medical intervention. The same must occur with habitual criminals. Marriages between Germans and Jews must be forbidden, at least as long as Jews generally remain upon German soil. That the Jews lose their rights of citizenship and must be subject to a new law appropriate to

them, is self-evident. Sexual intercourse, rape, etc., between Germans and Jews must be, according to the gravity of the case, punished by confiscation of property, expulsion, jail and death. The rights of citizenship must not be a gift at birth but must be acquired by labor. Only the fulfillment of duty and service for the honor of the people can award this right. Consequently, we must make a ceremony out of the award of citizenship to take the place of confirmation. Only when sacrifices have been made for something, is one also ready to fight for it.

This last measure will also automatically push those racial elements into the foreground which are organically most of all capable of serving the supreme value of our people. One needs only to allow a few companies of our *Wehrmacht* or the S.A. to march by, in order to see these heroic forces coming out from the subconscious. But in order to protect them from another stab in the back, we must insure that they are kept pure.

At a Viennese court a judge suggested leniency be exercised for an accused criminal because he had spent much of his time in a mercantile environment. Therefore his crime was to be evaluated and his responsibility diminished. This was even stated openly.

The Nordic idea of earlier times, that of strictly separating dishonorable actions from other offenses, has likewise vanished in democratic, raceless, legal life as in a raceless politics and trade. The last fragments admittedly still survive and a few live in honor for a certain duration or even for a lifetime. These value-saving fragments, are still the last type-forming and *Volk*-preserving forces which, however, are almost exhausted.

Under the sign of democracy even those ministers who accepted bribes were treated as men of honor. Indeed, men were severely punished for describing them as scoundrels. This occurred under the name of protection of the State. We can determine what kind of state we have according to the concept of honor. A new German law will therefore restore the scale of values between the honorable and dishonorable and increase the punishment for dishonorable behavior. Only in this way can a German type of man once again arise.

* * * *

Punishment is not in the first instance a means of education as our humanitarians wish to persuade us. Punishment is also not revenge. Punishment is, and here we are discussing punishment for dishonorable behavior, simply the singling out of types and natures alien to our type. A punishment for dishonorable crimes must therefore automatically bring with it loss of rights of citizenship, and, in grave cases, life-long expulsion

and confiscation of property. A man who does not regard the *Volkdom* and *Volk* honor as the highest values, has abandoned the right to be protected by this people. That for *Volk* and national betrayal prison—or the death penalty—must be fixed, is self-evident.

The German possesses, as has already been observed, a fateful peculiarity as a legacy of humanism and liberalism. He handles most problems, not in relation to blood and soil, but in a purely abstract way, as if definitions were something in "themselves" and as if it were a matter of elevating a more or less flexible value into the program of the most furious struggle. One such an abstract philosopher of the democratic kind of law was Karl Christian Planck. During the Franco-Prussian war he carried on an investigation to ascertain if Germany possessed the "right" to assert itself to obtain its necessities of life. In lengthy philosophic discussions, he came to the conclusion that Germany must abandon the nationalist idea, because it had a "provocative" effect upon her neighbors. But it did not enter the heads of the law philosopher Planck—and all his successors up to Schucking and Driedrich Wilhem Forster—that the nationalistic wave in the neighboring states necessarily called forth a justified defensive will in Germany. But in fact, what happened was that from this bloodless discrimination the German people had its vital rights cut short to the benefit of the national will of other peoples.

What gained political validity was completed in the same manner in internal politics. Rights were allotted to immigrant eastern Jews because of that abstraction of the law. It had nothing in common with the real rights of the German people but ran contrary to these. And thus things necessarily reached the stage, where, on the basis of abstract law, a legal favoritism toward the Jews, as opposed to Germans, came into existence.

In the same manner that the democratic pseudo-thinkers fought for "the Law," the convinced Social Democrat fought against "capital." Once again a bloodless concept or, more correctly, a mere word became the object of dispute between millions. At the same time it was clear that, between one kind of capital and another, fundamental differences extended. It is undeniable that capital is necessary to every enterprise. The only question that remains is: In whose hands is this capital to be found, and what are the principles by which it is to be governed, directed or supervised? This is what is decisive. The outcry against "capital" has become a tool where with demagogues have led us astray. These demagogues used the concept of *Volk*-hostile capital overlaid with productive material to rob us of natural treasures while allowing liquid international loan capital to vanish from Germany's sight.

If the conscious German Social Democrat had been clear about this from the start, that it was simply a matter of binding this fluid finance capital, which could easily be transferred from one state to another, then the State and *Volk*, by a seizure of power, could protect our national capital. Then the entire struggle against the domination of money and thus, the struggle against the real destructive capitalism, could be conducted in the correct form. But the Social Democrat trotted, clouded by phrases, behind the Jewish demagogues. He thus permitted the destruction of soil-linked capital and allowed himself to be made into a protagonist for *Volk*-destroying finance capital. The reason for this tragic catastrophe lay once again in the fact that the German only too easily took general, empty concepts for facts and was ready to shed his blood for phantoms.

Even in *Volkish* circles we have not remained completely free of bloodless antitheses. Many writers think in the following manner. They declare that today capital and property rule over labor. Consequently, in the sense of an eternal justice, the striving of everyone who is *Volk*-minded and everyone who is patriotic must be directed towards breaking the rule by property over labor. We must elevate labor as a value above property. In this abstract interpretation the antithesis is just an untenable as abstract philosophic investigations about "law" or the social democratic struggle against abstract capital. Here it is also necessary to distinguish between one kind of property and another. In the true sense property, personal property, is nothing other than congealed labor. For every really creative performance of labor, irrespective of realm, is nothing other than the process of the formation of property. Only the mysterious genius who is not measureable at all reaches beyond this. Ineradicably immersed within the human soul is the drive to enhance the satisfaction of daily existence beyond the yield of labor in such a way that, after silencing momentary impulses, a property remains behind. And in the same way that a man, driven by an inexplicable urge, wishes to survive through his children, so he also attempts to pass on property to the future, to his descendents. If this urge were not indwelling in man, he would not be an inventor and discoveror. He would never have become a creator. This feeling of personal property thus extends exactly to works of art and scientific works which spring from a superfluity of shaping powers and represent nothing other than property, acquired on the basis of surplus labor power and surplus labor capacity. To fight against property as a concept in itself, is thus at least thoughtless, but, in its practical carrying out, such a struggle would have to aim at exactly the same results as the Social Democratic struggle against "capital."

There is also another kind of property which does not represent the consequence of creative labor but is a utilization of this labor through speculation or a deceitful political news service. Here there results a completely practical criterion for judgement of the origin of a property. It is thus not a question of conducting a struggle against "property" as such but of a sharpening of the conscience; of the consciousness of honor and the concept of duty in accordance with the values of the German character.

As far as labor is concerned, it is self-evident that each and every position, insofar as these fit into the structure of the German totality, is of equal value and honor. Adolf Hitler has in this respect created the sole measuring rod for a working man in the following manner. The measure of the irreplaceability of a man within the entire *Volk* is determined by an assessment of the value of his work. However, it is self-evident that an order of rank results here. But it follows from this that work in itself cannot be set up in contrast to a property in itself. The anithesis consists far more in the distinction between one kind of property and another and between one kind of work and another. We have to ensure that property which is obtained dishonestly or by speculation is confiscated by the State. But personal property that is the fruit of labor is unconditionally recognized as an eternally driving cultural factor. In the differentation between kinds of labor an impelling momentum must be created so that, by viewing the standard of value in favor of the entire people, everyone will make efforts to extend the successes of individual labor. This then appears as the basic adjustment from which a future German can approach the problems of labor, property, speculation and capitalism. Everywhere the blood and what is *Volk*-linked must be regarded as the impelling element, not as a word and not as an empty concept.

Exactly the same holds in observation of the trade conflicts within the *Volk* totality. Strike and lock-out can condition one another. If one is permitted, then the other must also be permitted. If an industrialist may refuse the possibility of work, then the worker has the same right to withdraw his labor power from the owner of an enterprise. And in fact in an organized manner, since then the parties only confront each other one on one.

Strikes and lockouts in their present form are products of the liberal idea. The first has nothing to do with socialism, while the second, nothing to do with national economy. Both parts emanate from the egoism of a class and its class interests, without regard to the *Volk*-totality. The office of arbitration under the former socialist minister was an abortion. It

showed only how hopelessly devoid of ideas the state apparatus was. It was even afraid to proceed in a dictatorial manner because that would have conditioned the tangible responsibility of a Democratic Reich Labor Minister. But this would then have showed the extent of our betrayal into the hands of world capital without any attempt at disguise. There was no possibility of shifting the guilt onto other shoulders. But the financial Marxists feared this for very understandable reasons.

The creative German nation was the victim of three factors: industry, exploited manual workers and the helpless ministry of a Democratic-Social stamp. Those responsible for the great crisis were our earlier Reich goverments and thus the entire *Reichstag*.

Employers and workers are not individualities in themselves but parts of an organic whole, without which they all would not signify anything. For this reason the freedom of action both of the employer and the laborer was necessarily restricted as the interests of the *Volk* demand. However, this can only occur when the government acting here has not itself emanated from purely group interests. It further follows from this that the parliamentary mingling of commercial individualism and party politics was the cancerous illness of our accursed existence up to 1933. Therefore the social question can never be solved by social democracy and even less by communism. The latter would like to turn the whole of life upside down by declaring the part to be the whole. Even less could the crisis be solved by national trading capacities which had already failed by 1917. Today these corporations stand more helplessly than ever. "I have never occupied myself with the social question. The principal thing was that the chimneys smoked," said Hugo Stinnes in 1918 to H. Von Siemen. Even today a section of German heavy industry thinks like this, and has likewise cultivated a class struggle, "from above."

Thus, seen even from this side of practical life, the old pseudo-nationalism and the old pseudo-socialism die under our eyes accompanied by violent convulsions. Both were and are coupled unnaturally with cartel democracy. Both were poisoned through it and can be rid of the posion only through the new nationalism and socialism. Only in this way can we establish a readiness for a new State idea of racial organic life.

The philosophy from which this mode of observation originates directly opposes both the bourgeois-liberal and the Marxist. It is the very old German feeling for law which is today shattered. Roman law emphasized only the formal aspects of property. It singled it out as a thing in itself without developing a reference point. The German version of law does not recognize this view-point at all. It knows and recognizes only relation-

ships which are of an obligatory kind between private property and the community. These give character to property which means only justified property. It is here that the deepest poisoning of the socialist idea occurs. Alongside are those vast desolations brought about by Marxism. The first is the doctrine of internationalism, which disintegrates the *Volkisch* basis of all thought and feeling through the class struggle, which is designed to destroy the nation. This class struggle kills the living organism by stirring up one part of the nation to revolt against the other. Marxism also spawns pacifism which is intended to complete this work of destruction through the emasculation of foreign policy. There is another force that produces the deepest undertaking and the total destruction of the very concept of property. It is linked in the most inward way to the general Germanic idea of personality. Once Marxism seized on Proudhon's remark, "property is theft," it used this as the watchword in its struggle against capitalism and as an attack on private property. This is a thoroughly specious formula. The concept of theft is meaningless if no idea of property exists. It has raised Marxist demogogues to leadership and eliminated from it all honorable men. Thus, necessarily, under Marxist rule since 1918, it was not property which was declared to be theft but, conversely, the greatest thefts were legitimized in the name of equalization of property.

Suddenly it becomes blindingly clear to what the concept of property refers. A bourgeoisie devoid of ideas accuses the German Renaissance movement of hostility to property because it provides for the possibility, if necessary, of undertaking confiscations in the name of the national state. Even the bourgeoise, robbed by inflation, clings timidly to an outmoded idea of property. It prefers to feel conjoined with the greatest enemies of the people rather than to rethink its old ideas. But it is only a matter of precisely where the line between theft and justified property is to be drawn. For the true German who always links the ideas of law and of honor, legal property cannot be easily defined. On the other hand, with the democratic concept of property, men who really ought to be sitting in jail or hanging in the gallows travel in elegant frockcoats to international trade conferences as representatives of "free democracy." The new version of law which cannot accept tainted property as a personal possession is, as a result, the strongest guardian and protector of the truly German concept of property. This idea stands throughout in harmony with the ancient Germanic feeling for law.

And here we see a significant fact which leads us back to what was previously said: Socialism is for us not only the deliberate inauguration of *Volk*-protective measures, nor just an economic or social-political scheme.

It stems from innate values, that is to say, from the will. From the will and its values originate the ideas of duty and the law. Since the blood is one with that will, the words "socialism" and "nationalism" are not opposites but, in the deepest essence, one and the same in the same philosophic terms. It is a fact that both expressions of our life originate in a common primal will which evaluates that life in a particular way.

Only if one reflects upon and experiences the struggles of our times will he understand those prerequisites which give all other individual demands their color, unity and content. But if one tests each German with all vital questions from the viewpoint of the supreme value of blood-conditioned *Volk*, then, although he may occasionally err, he will always quickly become conscious of his error and be able to correct it.

* * *

On the basis of the state and legal viewpoints described, our entire present day economic system appears to us as inwardly rotten and hollow in spite of its enormous extent. The international cartels have celebrated dishonorable triumphs at the great economic conferences since 1919. Never before did the world witness a more shameless rule of money over all other values than when the millions of citizens in all nations were sacrificed on bloody battlefields in the belief that they fought for freedom, honor and fatherland. The shamelessness of international stock market piracy after its victory let slip all masks of freemasonic "humanity" and demonstrated with terrifying clarity not only democratic decadence but also the disintegration of the old nationalism which, with sword in hand, slavishly fought for the interests of the stock exchange. "Trade is our destiny," proudly declared Walter Rathenau, that hero of the international financial spirit. To carry on trade for the sake of trade was the "ideal" of that soulless era. The concept of honor was absent in the entire economic world of the nineteenth century whether trade was conducted by nationalists or internationalists. For this reason it established the rule of scoundrels over men of honor. In all colleges, professors taught the so-called laws of trade to which we were to submit ourselves. But they forgot that every "legal" effect has a point of departure, a prerequisite from which the necessary course of events ensues. The gold mania, artificially injected into us for example, is the prerequisite for the international gold currency which is held to be "according to natural law," but which, when the delusion is exposed, vanishes like the witch mania of the inquisitorial Middle Ages after the successful Enlightenment.

The racial chaos of the capital cities is the natural law consequent of the freedom of movement. The dictatorship of the stock market is the necessary consequence of the worship of trade and profit. It will vanish when a new idea, borne by new men, becomes the basis of economic life. Here also it is the Nordic concept of honor which will one day create a new law through its representatives. Once a bankruptcy, even if undeserved, was regarded as dishonorable. Insolvency brought not only the bankrupt person himself, but others, to the abyss. But in the present world even international bankruptcy is good business and the racketeer is seen as a useful member of democratic society. The law of the coming Reich will sweep here with an iron broom. It will fullfill the words of Lagarde concerning Jews. He said that one cannot convert plague bacilli but must render them harmless as quickly as possible. Millions groan today under a terrible injustice. They clamor for a solution through wage increases and monetary revaluations, etc. They do not comprehend that their misery is the outcome of the universal elevation of trade to the position of supreme value. But they will at once understand what has taken place in the last hundred years when once the rope and the gallows begin the necessary cleansing. It will be remarkable how quickly the entire specter will collapse when the energentic hand of a strong man seizes by the neck the strutting frockcoated rabble and renders them impotent by the legal means of a new justice. Law is for us only that which serves German honor. A true economy is therefore only that which is based on this principle as once were the noble craft guilds. So even today is the way of the Hanseatic League.

There will be differences of opinon concerning technical measures. These cannot be dealt with here because other conditions may make means necessary which cannot be accurately assessed today. One cannot lay down in detail the laws of a spiritual revolution. It is only necessary to recognize our starting point and then to strive passionately for our ultimate goal.

In our view the economy is integrated into the system of type-creating powers as are law and politics. All serve but one end. A future German state will need to fit two additional important measures into the core of its legal structure and these correspond to the organic selection processes of nature: banishment and outlawry. If a German has been guilty of grave violations of his national duties by conduct which goes beyond what is pardonable personal blemish, then there is no reason any longer for the *Volksgemeinschaft* to tolerate and nourish this harmful unit in its midst. Through its courts, therefore, it will pronounce either temporary or per-

manent banishment. In serious cases of flight to escape German jurisdiction, the criminal must be outlawed. No German anywhere in the world will then be permitted to have any personal or professional contact with him. All political and economic means must be brought to bear to ensure the implementation of this declaration of outlawry. As for the criminal's family, decisions must vary from case to case and, in any event, it must be a consideration.

By pampering criminals, the democratic state promotes a process of negative selection detrimental to the stock and compels the creative *Volk* to support a great percentage of criminals and to care for their similarly-afflicted offspring. Denial of citizenship rights, banishment and outlawry would soon bring about a very noticeable purification of modern life, enhancement of all creative forces, and consequently a strengthening of self-confidence. This is the first prerequisite of a vigorous foreign policy.

Today, the matter of illegitimate children is treated with a repulsive hypocrisy. The churches heap disgrace, contempt and social ostracism upon "fallen women," while the organic enemies of the nation call for the demolition of all standards and demand racial chaos, sexual collectivism and unrestricted abortion.

From the racial viewpoint, all this is seen in a different light. Certainly monogamy is to be protected and retained as the organic cell of the *Volkstrum*, but Professor Wieth-Knudsen has already correctly argued that without periodical polygamy the Germanic current of peoples during earlier centuries would never have arisen and consequently all bases for the culture of the West would have been lacking (Professor Dr. K.A. Wieth-Knudsen, *Frauenfragen und Feminismus*, Stuttgart, 1926). This is certainly the best work which has been written on this topic to date. The author says: "I also accept monogamy but this does not influence my understanding of the fact that the periodical polygamy of our ancestors is the reason that the White men, emerging from the impoverished area of Northwest Europe, are still, in spite of all setbacks, so numerously represented today, while the struggle of Christianity against polygamy simultaneously promoted a decline of the military-political development of our race--a logical connection which till now has not been recognized or evaluated.

This truth elevates the historical fact above all moralizing. There were later periods in which women far outnumbered men. Such is the case again today. Should these millions of women be regarded with a pitying smile as old maids who have been robbed of their vital right? Should a hypocritical, sexually-satisfied society pass contemptuous judgement upon

them? The coming Reich will reject both these attitudes. While retaining monogamy, it will show to mothers of German children, including those whose children are born out of wedlock, the same respect and equal social and legal status. Obviously such a policy will be attacked by the churches and by the female presidents of all "social" and "moral" associations. It is such as they who find acceptable a marriage between a Catholic German and a Catholic mulatto while applying social and religious pressure against the marriage of a German Catholic and a German Protestant. They take the view that racial pollution is wholly moral and Christian, but they riase a hypocritical howl if we advocate consideration of biological and spiritual factors in order to preserve the race and strengthen the *Volkstum*. The excess of births over deaths in Germany in 1874 was 13.4 per thousand; in 1904, it was 14.5, but in 1927 only 6.4! The somewhat lower mortality rate exacerbates these figures by disguising the deficit of women of childbearing age. According to Lenz, Germany needs 1,366,000 live births in order to stabilize its population at 78,000,000 but in 1927 only 1,160,000 were born. That is, from the necessary minimum figure for the maintenance of the stock, there is already a 15% deficiency. The present excess of births cannot therefore be of long duration. In a few decades, the generation which is now middle-aged will have reached old age, and, then, with the consequent mortality a population deficiency will be seen. One should add that the peoples of the East continue to increase in numbers. Russia, in spite of all her miseries, gains annually about three million. Thus the question for the German people is whether it will perish. If, therefore, in the face of many childless marriages, notwithstanding the great excess of women, healthy unmarried Germans bring children into the world, then that constitutes a strengthening of the German people. We are approaching the time of great battles for survival itself. Some reject our views. These are the sexually satisified moralists and the presidents of female-organizations which knit sweaters for Negroes or eagerly donate to Missions of Zulus. These are the ones who campaign against "immorality" if anyone urges the preservation of our endangered substance. But we know that these ideas are absurd. All else is secondary to that which will produce healthy German stock. A genuine morality and the maintenance of national freedom are inconceivable without this prerequisite. Standards which are good in orderly and peaceful eras can become fatal in times of a struggle for destiny and bring about decline. The future German Reich will evaluate this entire question from a new viewpoint and create corresponding life forms. This consideration is also involved in evaluating race-mixing. If a German voluntarily miscegenates

with Negroes, Orientals, half breeds or Jews, then he is no case entitled to legal protection--not even for his legitimate or illegitimate children who, in turn, shall not be entitled to German citizenship. Rape by someone of alien race will be punished by flogging, jail, confiscation of property and lifelong banishment form the German Reich. Spiritually, politically and militarily, the foundation will have been laid for the emergence of a new aristocracy. It will be seen that by an inner necessity such men are, by physical appearance, 80% Nordic. The fulfillment of these values is directly linked with the highest values of the blood. With some others, the genetic picture predominates over the individual appearance and is revealed only through deeds. It would be superficial to go to work with foot rules and cephalic indices in order to evaluate the individual. But confirmation of a life devoted to the service of the nation is of the greatest concern. However, with an upbreeding of the race, a Nordic ideal of beauty will emerge.

The new aristocracy will be an aristocracy of both blood and achievement. It will descend from fathers to sons but it will be extinguished if the son commits offenses which are dishonorable. Nor will it necessarily be renewed in the fourth generation if the third reveals inferior traits. The German aristocratic order will need to be, in the first place, built of farmers and warriors because in such professions sheer physical health is most securely preserved. In this the basis for the breeding of healthy descendants is most likely to be established. More caution will have to be observed in the matter of ennobling artists, scholars or politicians, however great may be their honorable achievements. The old democracy rewarded only with money but the new Germany will reward its great leaders with honors.

Since 1918, the old titles of nobility have become merely nominal instead of being legally based in the structure of the community. The coming Reich will not restore the old social nobility but will make confirmation of noble titles dependent upon proven worth in the struggle for Germany. Without such confirmation the old noble name will become merely a common civic one.

Nobility which was awarded on the grounds of personal conduct in the Great War will require no further confirmation. In this way, nobility would no longer be a feature of a caste constituting a horizontal social layer but would pass vertically through all the ranks of the *Volk*. It would spur on all healthy, strong, creative forces to the highest achievements. We will not do this in the democratic sense of granting license to the

talented even if they are otherwise corrupt. All personal achievements must begin with a concept of both personal and national honor.

It will be necessary to go further. The idea of racial law is an adjunct to the recognition of concrete natural law. That law was once regarded as something holy. The gods at first were embodiments of natural forces. Later they became the bearers of a moral idea. A *Volk* which fails to understand natural law will be unable to grasp the nature of the moral law. A *Weltanschaung* which sees creation merely as an arbitrary god, recognizes no inner worth of man. The creation of the world from nothing requires a fundamental corollary belief in a "Creator" who later intrudes —or can intrude—in the world whenever it pleases him to do so. This denies the inner law of natural causation. Such is the world view of the Semites, the Jews and of Rome. The magic of the medicine man is a part of the proclamation of the "Almighty" who interferes in the world from the outside. Such systems of belief recognize no organic laws. It sees only the tyrannical rule of their "god" or of his Vicar who would wish to impose his *corpus juris canonici* upon the entire world in the name of ecumenism.

Nordic-Western man recognizes an eternal law of nature and is able, thanks to this perception, to create a genuine cosmic science. Once with Odin we had produced the first great allegory of the moral idea of god. Odin, the highest god, was the guardian of law and of contracts. The law was sacred like the oath. The whole race of gods perished because Odin himself had sinned against the sacred nature of a contract--even though it was unwittingly, and as a result of being tricked by the bastard Loki. Only his death was expiation. Here we see the idea of honor as the ultimate measuring rod of the Nordic man. Its violation must be expiated other than through a drama.

A spiritually conditioned conformity to nature is also at work. This is something our scholars unsuspectingly pass by. Our present decline recapitulates the myth of the Edda, which, given present world events, attains a mystical, superhuman greatness. When honor, and law and strength of will disintegrate, the gods perish. A world epoch collapsed in a terrible blood-red conflagration in 1914. It is the task of the future to meld together once more these three great entities under the aegis of the German *Volk* State.

* * *

V. Church and School of the German People

A German peoples church is today the longing of millions. The confirmation of this fact means that we must demand the profoundest responsibility from those who give expression to this longing. Today there has been enough loud talk. Indeed, there has been more than enough! We talk about the insufficiency of the form and of the content of our churches. The deep underlying roots of this feeling of dissatisfaction have been discussed in this work whilst showing respect towards religious thought. This theology has been ennobled by the faith, life and death of many generations. But the truth demands the immediate admission that this new longing has nowhere yet appeared as vital action, as an allegory of life.

In no German region has a religious genius appeared. No one has come forth to reveal through his life a new religious type to replace the existing ones. This fact is decisive insofar as no German conscious of responsibility may direct a demand to leave the churches at those who still cling to them in faith. If one did so it could possibly make the masses uncertain and disintegrate them spiritually. Before we destroy what the people presently have we must be prepared to offer a substitute.

The liberal epoch brought enormous desolation in the church domain. This was precipitated by its many pseudo-scientific beliefs such as evolu-

tion. Religion as such seemed to be. These intellectual pygmies overlooked the fact that understanding and reason represent only one means of drawing up a world picture. Religion is fundamentally something else. Art is a third means of understanding. Science is a system. Religion relates to the will. Art is symbolic. Every domain has its own inner law. Science could only destroy the churches when the latter falsely risked entering the former's domain. This occurred in a thousand cases. Real science can never destroy real religion because the latter is only a symbol for organic values of will. If a religion is to be re-structured newly born or replaced through another, then the supreme values must be overthrown or transvaluated.

The tragic thing about the spiritual history of the last hundred years is that the churches have made the liberal-materialistic outlook their own. They then defended their position in the field of science instead of operating in their own sphere of values. And it is even more tragic that they had to do this since they were developed historically. They had proclaimed Old Testament tales to be true. The later materialistic legends were the fundamental constituent of their totality. Thus the Darwinian era was able to create enormous confusion. It is instructive to compare the initial representation of the link between rationalism and magic. Simultaneously, science and religion were to free the way for occult sects: theosophy, anthroposophy and a large number of other secret doctrines and charlatan hoaxes. A frightful confusion of spirit, for which dogmatism and liberalism bear the same guilt, is the sign of the times. Even under the rule of the Christian-Social party in Austria over 200,000 persons in Vienna alone have left the Catholic Church in the course of not less than ten years. These conversions came under the influence of new religious values but as a consequence of a Marxist, egocentric activity which destroyed communal values which were directed against a still rigid, coercive, materialistic dogma.

Between the mass hosts of Marxist chaos and the faithful of the churches millions wander around upon false paths. These people are completely destroyed inwardly. They have been delivered up to confusing doctrines and false prophets who seek only personal gain. In the large, however, they were driven by a powerful longing for new values and new forms.

It must be stated over and again that we must have a new genius who will reveal the new myth to us. That saviour has still not been granted to us. This recognition still does not remove us from the duty of performing those preliminary works which have always had to be done when a new

vital feeling struggles for expression, producing spiritual tensions. Soon the time will come for the great man who will teach and live what, hitherto, millions have only been able to stammer.

As the introduction to this work says, our message is not directed at the present day generation who still believe in the church. We will not hinder them from pursuing their established, chosen course of life. It is directed at all those who have already broken inwardly with church belief but have still not found their way to another mythos. These persons must at least be snatched away from despairing Nihilism through a revitalization, through a new feeling of belonging. We seek the rebirth of very old yet eternally young values. It will be the task of a later genius to elevate to real forms of religion. Presently, many can search for probable representations. This is the duty of each individual today. Every individual must search since religious societies without religious geniuses only grow rigid. They turn into ordinary associations and small sects, which have no lasting influence over others. To occupy oneself with religion is therefore not a matter of any particular existing ethical, social or political association. Conversely, these can not be made responsible for the personal religious creed of their members.

From the newly blossoming nationalist mythos grow spiritual powers in all directions. Each of these organizations can only be guided by great personalities. It is naturally possible that one of them embodies a concentration of many powers of will. However, such a claim should be raised only by a completely great man devoid of any fault in character and soul.

Thus we wait for the poet of the world war, for the great dramatist of our life, for the great architects and sculptors. Thus we struggle for the Fuhrer of the new Reich. We try to outline the limits of will which apply to the coming German Volk Church. Its essential character seems to be clearly outlined even today. On the one side, we reject the materialist-magical which, as revealed by liberalism, was so closely linked with church dogmatism. On the other we must cultivate the values of honor, pride, inward freedom, "aristocracy of soul" and faith in the indestructibility of the soul of man.

All Christian, or, more correctly, Pauline, churches have recognized certain supernatural doctrines as dogmas. They have become the prerequisites of church membership. From a universal community of sentiment grew rigid, dogmatic equality. This idea increasingly was out of touch with the Nordic community. The declaring-as-true of metaphysical and religious assertions and historical and legendary events were assumed without evidence to be true. Such ideas were conditioned by Judaism.

The Syrian-Jewish idea had advanced by using fire and sword. Today, this has given way compulsively to a more tolerant standpoint, although it is ready at every opportunity to fan new dogmatic battles.

A real German statesman and thinker will therefore approach the religious question from another perspective. He will give unhindered place to every religious conviction. He will allow moral doctrines of diverse form to be free preached, providing only that they do not stand in the path of assertion of national honor. That is, they must strengthen the willed centers of soul. Where the support of definite organizations is concerned the German will on the contrary have to assess the conduct of these organizations toward the national state. From this perspective the question is self-evident concerning the relationship of state, religion and church. A real German state can approve the church communities that exist at a particular time. The state will proceed with complete tolerance toward these sects. We will permit state political and financial support depending upon the extent to which their teachings and practical activity are adjusted to the furtherance of strengthening of souls. It will therefore also need to protect new reforms as well as old creeds. The new demands, however, already have been announced in an extraordinary way.

Accordingly, the so-called Old Testament must be abolished once and for all as a book of religion. By this, the unsuccessful attempt of the last one and a half thousand years to make us spiritually into Jews will be eliminated. This is an attempt for which we, among other things, had to thank our terrible materialistic Jewish rulers.

Viewed from the perspective of the struggling man and not of the state politicians, the movement is to be strengthened further by the removal of open distorted and superstitious reports from the New Testament. The necessary fifth Gospel cannot naturally be added by a synod. It will be the creation of a man who experiences the longing for purification very deeply. He probably will have studied the theology of the New Testament.

From the description of Jesus one can select very different features. His personality often makes its appearance as soft and pitying, then, again, bluff and rough. But it is always supported by inward fire. It was in the interest of the Roman church, with its lust for power, to represent subservient humility as the essence of Christ in order to create as many servants as possible for this motivated ideal. To correct this representation is a further ineradicable requirement of the German movement for renewal. Jesus appears to us today as self-conscious master in the best and highest sense of the word. It is his life which possesses significance

for Germanic man, not his tortured death. The success of that idea was the work of the Alpine and Mediterranean people. The powerful preacher and the angry man in the temple, the man who impelled others along with him and whom they all followed, not the sacrificial lamb of Jewish prophecy, not the crucified, is today the formative ideal which shines forth to us from the Gospels. And if it cannot shine forth, then the Gospels are dead.

The scientific criticism of the text has made such rapid progress that all technical prerequisites for a comprehensive new creation are present. The Gospel of Mark probably contains, even if with additions, the real core of the message of the child of God. This stands in opposition to the Semitic doctrine of the slave of God. The Gospel of John was the first gentile interpretation. We find here the eternal polarity of good and evil in contrast to the Old Testament delusion that Jehovah created good and evil out of nothing. Simultaneously he said of his world that it was "very good," in order to then himself become instigator of lies, deceit and murderous deeds. Mark still knew nothing of Jesus other than as the "fulfiller" of the Jewish idea of the Messiah. Thus, Matthew and Paul have provided us with the misfortune of the entire western cultural world. Still more: When the gossip Peter says of Jesus: "Thou art the Messiah" (Mark 8,29), Jesus threatened Peter and forbade his disciples to utter similar words. Our Pauline churches are therefore, in essentials, not Christian. They are the product of the Jewish-Syrian leanings of the apostles. These ideas were introduced by the Jerusalem author of the Matthew Gospel. Later, Paul completed the subversion of Christianity independently of Mark.

From the pharisee Paul slips out unconsciously a universal Jewish admission: "What kind of advantage have the Jews, or of what use is circumcision? In truth, very much. First, to them is confided what God has spoken. But that many do not believe in this, what does it matter? Should their lack of faith cancel God's faith? Nothing could be further from the truth." (See Romans 3.)

Then follows the typical Jewish arrogance and intolerance, "But I make it known to you, dear brothers, that the Gospel which is preached by me, is not human. For I have received it from no man nor learnt it, but through the revelation of Jesus Christ. But since it pleased God, who has separated me from my mother's body and called me through his mercy, that he revealed his son in me, that I should make him known through the Gospel among the heathens, then I talked at once no longer with flesh and blood, also did not go up to Jerusalem to them who are apostles before me, but

moved to Arabia and then came back again to Damascus." (Galatians 1.)

Simultaneously, the mollusk-like soliciting: "For albeit I am free of everyone, still have I made myself into the servant of everyone, so that I may win many of them. To the Jews I have come as a Jew, so that I win the Jews. To those who are under the law, I have become as under the law, so that I gain those who are under the law. To those who are without laws, I have become as without law. Nevertheless I am not without law before God, but I am the law of Christ, so that I win those who are without law. To the weak I have become like a weak man, so that I win the weak. I am all things to all men, so that I everywhere make some blessed."

And then the brazen statement of shameless pride: "It were better for me, that I die, then that anyone should make my fame into nothing for me!" (1 Corinthians 9.) Paul has deliberately gathered around him all those rejected by the state and the spiritually leprous in the lands of his earthly domain, in order to unleash an uprising by the inferior. The first chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians is a sole song of praise to the "foolish in the eyes of the world". Simultaneously the assertion is made that God has chosen the "ignoble and those despised by the world," in order to then promise that the Christians shall rule as judges. "So shall now the world be judged by you, are you then not good enough to judge small matters? How much more over temporal goods" (6, 2-3). In Ephesians (1,21) Paul attributes to Jesus all power and force and princedom of this world and the future world.

It cannot even be disputed that he wished for a world upheaval with help of the declassed of all states and peoples with the aim of a theocracy. His false humility was coupled with a desire for world dominion. He displayed an overheated "religious" longing as with all Orientals. He desired to march at the head of the rebels. Such was the Pauline falsification of the great figure of Christ.

John has interpreted Jesus in a genial way. He recognized that here one was dealing with an anti-Jewish spirit hostile to the Old Testament. But this has been covered over by a Jewish tradition which was linked with the spiritual waste products of the Hellenic world shaped anew in the Roman church.

Europe has tried to renew, in vain, this Oriental church. Europe's reverence of its Christianity has condemned all attempts to failure. But the Christian churches are a monstrous, deliberate and unconscious falsification of the simple happy message of the kingdom of heaven within us. They are a falsification of the child of God and of service for the good and of passionate defense against evil. In the Gospel of Mark we admittedly find the lengendary features of the possessed which we can likewise

trace back to popular tales. These are embellishments and additions to fact, like, for instance, Frederick the Great and Saint Francis. The latter is said to have even preached to the birds. But the original gospel of Mark is completely remote from ecstatic rapture in which parts of the Sermon on the Mount exceed themselves. But to resist not evil and to turn the other cheek when the right one is struck, are feminist additions which are not to be found in Mark. These are falsified additions by other persons. Jesus's entire existence was a fiery rebellion. Therefore he had to die. Only inwardly bastardized men have laid value on a doctrine of cowardice, such as, for instance, Tolstoy who used this passage as the foundation for his desolate outlook on the world.

There is no proof for the often-made claim that Jesus was a Jew. Indeed, there is much to show the contrary. Jesus possibly was Aryan, or partially so, showing the Nordic type strongly. Let us look at *Die historische Personlichkeit Jesu* (Munich, 1924). It reports that, according to the Syrian-Christian preacher Ephraem (fourth century A.D.), Jesus had a Danaite woman, that is, someone *born* in Dan, for a mother and a Latin as father. Ephraem sees nothing dishonorable in this, adding: "Jesus thus derived his ancestry from two of the greatest and most famous nations—namely, from the Syrians on the maternal side and from the Romans on the paternal." Ephraem presupposes the universal acknowledgement of this fact.

* * *

The religion of Jesus was, without doubt, centered in the preaching of love. All theology is, in fact, principally spiritual excitement which will always be closely related to love. No one will disregard this feeling. It creates a spiritual flow from man to man. When a German religious movement wishes to develop into a Volk church it will need to explain the ideal of love of one's neighbor. Such love must be unconditionally subordinated to national honor. No action by a German church will be permitted which does not, in first place, serve the security of the Volkhood. As a result we lay down indissoluble opposition to an outlook which openly declares that bonds to the church stand higher than those to the nation.

Such an attitude, cultivated for centuries, can, however, be overcome neither by bans nor commands. The state has solely to ensure with its means, that political power intrusions on the part of Rome and its servants do not succeed. The Roman priest must give an oath upon his

appointment to an office, which signifies nothing other than a conscious incitement to interdenominational and class hatred. Beyond even this he veritably signifies the recognition of activity treasonable to the nation, if the state is not serviceable to Roman interests. This oath reads as follows: "The false teachers, separated from the apostolic chair, the rebels against our Lord and his successors, I will persecute and fight according to my powers." The new German state must ban such an oath. It must lay upon all clergy an oath aimed at the preservation of the honor of the nation. This oath must be similar to the oath given to the monarch or, in some states, to the constitution. As for the rest, it will be the chief task of the awakening Germany to make efforts in service of the mythos of the nation to create a German Volk church. We will work until a second Meister Eckehart one day releases the tension and embodies, lives and shapes this German community of souls.

Party political activity is forbidden in all states to a member of the army. We justify this in order to keep political power in hand. It must be the instrument of the whole. It must not be eaten away by political conflict. The same must also hold for priests of all denominations. Their domain is the care of souls, that is, spiritual welfare. The emergence of the politically active parliamentary military man and pastor is a highly unrefreshing phenomenon of political liberalism. The Italian Fascist state already realized this. Under the Concordat of 1929 political activity was refused to the Catholic priesthood. The Catholic boy scout leagues were dissolved, so as not to allow a state within a state to arise. Since the Vatican has approved this for Italy, it can no longer object in principle to the implementation of identical measures in other neighboring states.

If the distinction provided by Jesus's words: "Give unto God, what is God's, and unto Caesar what is Caesar's!" is carried through, then other necessary intrusions by the national state into the domain of church creeds can be completely avoided. Such a statesman will never operate on some kind of metaphysical principles of belief or occasion religious persecutions. The conflict around these worlds of ideas and values will therefore have to be played out from man to man, from form to form within the entire Volk organism, without political means of power being able to lay claims on anything.

A differentiation must be made with all these considerations of religious reform between the spiritual advisor and the director of the political state. If the first uncovers the inner direction of a new search, and, in so doing, in accordance with its nature, fights against the old concepts and forms in the construction of a soul-spirit body, then the spiritual advisor

has no right to demand the political, judicial and military protection of the state. It was fatal for real fervor of faith that the Roman Church, with help from political organizations, strove everywhere to secure a "worldly arm," As a result it has today acquired an enormously strong position of power. However, it has also, in many cases, thanks to donations from the states, become dependent upon these states. An embargo on money could easily cause the giant organizational apparatus to collapse in many places. But the position of political power has, and this is an old complaint of spiritual guardians for centuries, rubbed out conscience and reflection. The same thing has done great damage to Protestantism. This religious movement believed it could not stand behind and thus behaved likewise. After the separation of the state and the organizations of the various churches this monetary feature will still long continue. A German church must therefore from the first reject being made financially dependent upon the state. It must only claim freedom for growth, so that its believers are not harmed by the ways of the old churches. It will be given space and buildings according to the number of believers it has attracted. The same measure must then also be applied to other denominations. The Catholics and Protestants must secure their church through voluntary contributions. They must raise their funds through pledges, not by threats. Thus, religion will be supported according to its acceptance, not according to its political power. Through such a measure can a statesman alone be just on all sides. He will separate the religious struggle of the individual and of the groups of the population from the political struggle of the whole.

A German church cannot preach dogmatic principles in which everyone is compelled to believe or face loss of eternal bliss. It will encompass communities which hold firm to beautiful Catholic customs, many of which are often old Nordic in origin. Those who favor the Lutheran forms of religious service and those who perhaps prefer another form of religious worship will also be protected. The German church, however, will also grant equal rights to those who have broken with Syrian-Roman Christianity generally and have found themselves in a new community. Some of these will be under the sign of Meister Eckehart's spiritual power. The prerequisites made at the beginning are valid for all members.

Thus, in the foundation of a German national church, it is a matter not of disputing any kind of metaphysical assertions or of promoting the credence of legendary tales. It is a matter of the creation of a high feeling of value, i.e., of the selection of those men, who, despite all diversity of religious and philosophic convictions, regained deep inward

confidence in their own type and gained a heroic view of life by struggle. This reversion of spirit and soul appears to me to be particularly revolutionary, since, as a result, the principal object of former religious struggles—metaphysical dogmas—are recognized as inessential. Their representation becomes an affair of the individual, not of a totality. The conflicts concerning the relationship of man and God in Jesus, the conflict concerning love and grace, concerning the immortality or mortality of the soul, fall away from the angle of vision of a Germanic-German religious renewal, as a measure for membership of the new community appears the recognition of those values which have been created in Germanic dramatic art. These are included and revealed greatest of all in the mysticism of Master Eckehart. But a community must be the aim, even if the recognition so pervades us today that we can no longer experience it. Despite all strength even a strong individual cannot always maintain the height of his heroic moments. But the community consciousness will be able to elevate him still higher and draw the weaker with it. It will fit in more firmly into the new religious style of the future, as once the German army of 1914 made millions of simple men perform heroic sacrifices and deeds.

After the dishonorable Vatican Council honorable Catholic men, misunderstanding the nature of a thousand year old dogmatism, made efforts to bring to life the so-called Old Catholicism. Many of these believers tolerated the very worst persecutions because they would not allow their honor to be trampled under foot. Bismarck had not then seized the opportunity to protect these free-minded men. But the movement alone was too weak to run its head against the tradition of centuries. Bismarck's conduct had bitterly avenged itself. The Old Catholic communities became impoverished because of the violent Roman technique of strangulation. This the Vatican did with the world-political means of power at its disposal. This power in its German form created the pliable Center Party as the Guard of His Holiness. "Long live the Church Inquisition!" cried the Jesuit Wenis in 1875. "There must be no interdenominational peace!" answered the *Schildwacht* on 16th May 1924 after its triumph. Thus the first real stimulus to allow a new birth to emerge from the womb of Catholicism remained fruitless. But it is beyond question that thousands of splendid Germans now work as priests within the Roman Church and in their deepest heart strive for nothing with more longing than the purification of Christianity from Syrian superstition. They work for the deepening of religious life through separation of State monies and incitements to political power. They all know that the German sermons which they are able to utter to their fellow citizens today have been bought with streams

of the blood of those heretics, who, once, at Rome's command, had to ascend the stake or were tortured to death in subterranean cellars. They will be joyful when they are able to, once more, hold the purified worship of God in the sacred mother tongue. This would serve our proud racial values. The time has still not come when German priests can stand in the midst of the Roman dominated upper caste and demand a reshaping of soul, head and limbs. But it will come. There will have to be martyrs as in the past. But a German state has the duty to protect these men from persecution. Some will be initiated into the German Volk Church.

The same holds for those who have recognized that Protestantism has ceased to protest against Rome. Today it is zealously opposed, in short-sighted bedazzlement, against the new arising vital life. Former Protestant rebels appeared to fight against their church in the name of religion. They supported the "Second Reich" in the name of Liberalism. They fought for renewal in the *Berliner Tageblatt*. This signified the bankruptcy of soul and church in the nineteenth century, such as appeared in all domains. Out of fear at this sign of open decline a younger generation fled back once more to strict churchliness. It now ossifies without hope in the general superintendant posts. Today the Lutheran Church is also stirring again. Naturally the alarm bells are sounded against the awakening innovators here. The Lutheran literates and Pharisees today summon, out of an instinct of self-preservation, a congress in the same way as Rome has its councils. But this time they do not see facing them a liberalizing phenomenon of disintegration, but a full-blooded Mythos of substantial content. It possess a center, around which everything takes form and shape. In the whole of Germany today germination cells of this new awakening exist. This new German Reich will also need to grant them its state protection in the course of coming persecutions.

The German Faith Communities have hitherto not passed into a stage beyond a theoretical beginning. The practical attempts have not been encouraging. But in whatever manner these develop, the research carried out by these bodies in the realm of Nordic religious history will nevertheless form the yeast which will permeate the former Catholic and the former Lutheran components of the German Church. In place of the Old Testament pimps and cattle dealer stories the Nordic sagas and legends will appear, at first simply told and later represented through symbols. It is not the dream of hatred and murderous messianism but the dream of honor and freedom which must be kindled through Nordic, Germanic sagas—from Odin by way of the old folk tales up to Eckehart and Walther

von der Vogelweide. It will be reserved for a genial hand to select from the spiritual sediment of millennia the hitherto neglected pearls of the German spirit and to bind them together organically. What is temporal, Roman and Jewish-conditioned appears clearer than ever today. But all the more distinctly the real heartbeat of our folktales resounds. We hear tales of Eckehart and Luther in our ears. For more mature pupils a vivid picture of religious searching from Iran, India, indeed also from Hellas, will unroll, alien and yet simultaneously closely related. The longing to give the Nordic race soul its form as German church under the sign of the Volk mythos, that is for me the greatest task of our century. Just as the Roman mythos of the representation of God by the Pope comprised very different peoples and opposing directions and bound them, so will the mythos of the blood, once grasped, bind like a magnet all personalities and religious communities, irrespective of their diversities, in a clear structure bearing relationship to a center. Thus, we have a life-creating arrangement transformed into the Volk totality. The coming life will then clarify and determine individual details of its structure. No one can foresee them today.

These parts of the Volk Church must be protected by all means by the State from persecution. Otherwise it must rely upon its own resources. It must form a crystallization point. The churches will have money placed at their disposal according to the size and importance. Their communities will provide the possibility of direct teaching activity, and without any kind of violent intrusion into Protestantism or into the Roman Church. A spiritual revolution will be completed which will take effect like a deep drawing of breath. The heavy crust of Syrian-Roman domination can no longer oppress those who long for honor and freedom. The Roman whore and the Old Testament superintendant will gradually lose their power over individual personalities, and, consequently, also over political activities. The first prerequisites for a religious, but, then, also, for a cultural and State life-style will be created.

* * *

The new German racial church will make changes in the Roman ritual. It will abandon sermons about slaves and scapegoats and the lamb of God. It will forget about claiming that Peter founded the Roman Church. There will be no more talk of the fulfillment of the Old Testament, of Indulgences or of miraculous powers. A corresponding alteration of external rites will also have to result. We will work hand in hand with the great

literature of enlightenment, which is to be spread by the spiritual heads of the German Church within their existing communities. From this new inward attitude toward the image of Jesus, however, there also results an unconditionally necessary if seemingly only outward alteration: the replacement of the crucifixes representing the tortured crucifixion in churches and on the village streets. The crucifix is the allegory of the teaching of the sacrificial lamb, an image which brings before our mind the collapse of all powers. Through this horrid representation of pain the church produces inward oppression and makes us humble. This serves the church well in its search for power. Admittedly the representations of Germanic knights and gods have been preserved in Saint George, Saint Martin, Saint Oswald but thus far they lead only a subordinated existence. The church in northern Europe has not reduced as yet to kissing the bloody, suppurating wounds of the crucified Christ figure. The Roman Church encourages this practice among many of the South American faithful. Without question the figure of the sorrowful crucified Christ has become the means by which Rome rules the souls of its adherents.

In the churches allotted to it, a German Church will gradually represent the hero in highest sense with fiery instructive spirit taking the place of the Crucifixion. Almost all painters of Europe have divested the face and the figure of Jesus of all Jewish racial characteristics. However, distorted by teachings of the lamb of God, it had to paint Jesus as the Saviour of all men. All great artists of the Nordic West showed Jesus as Aryan and represented him a slim, tall, blond, high-browed and long-headed. Even the great artists of the South have not shown any understanding for a hooked-nosed, flat-footed saviour. Even in the Resurrection by Matthisa Grunewald Jesus is blond and slim. From the breast of the Sistine Madonna the blond Jesus looks veritably heroically at the world in an identical manner to the heads of blue-eyed angels from the clouds. Our awakening feeling of life does not recognize the ideal of flagellation. A real Crucifixion can, as already elaborated, be today neither painted nor sculptured nor versified nor set to music. The entire German artistic community which today makes efforts with vegetable still lifes have only recently been appointed the guardians of the German soul. The churches and communities of the German Church will ensure that at old sacred places of pilgrimage the bastard art products of the Baroque period bearing Jesuit approval are replaced with paintings and statues appropriate to our church. We will show an Aryan Jesus as the bringer of life who appears alongside the god with the spear. There will be other pictures; some depicting the sayings of Meister Eckehart and other

German preachers. From the naves and from the altars of the German Volk Church our own style will show. The tinplate haloes, the plaster garlands and all that Jesuit-inspired junk of the Baroque and Roccoco style will be discarded. Tasks will here await the German architect. Thousands long for true architecture. These people are tired of building merchant buildings and bank palaces. They look for direction. Our music allows itself it be used most easily. In Bach and Gluck, in Mozart, Handel and Beethoven, the heroic character was set. It can again emerge from church versification. Music today is aimless and vacuous. Here, again, there is much work to be done. First, the church songbooks will be cleansed of songs to Jehovah.

The future of our life will thus depend on inner withdrawal from things that are religious and metaphysical. From one center a flow of current will pour out over everything which allows the soul of the preacher and of the statesman to be equally as fruitful as the fantasy of the present-day centerless, therefore almost insane, artist and philosopher.

If one travels today through German towns and cities, then one can confirm with joy that everywhere memorial stones and heroic statues have been erected. The German front soldier in steel helmet reveals the type. Inscriptions on the sockets give the names of heroes. Flowers and wreaths give proof of the love which envelops the memory of the dead. We have ourselves still experienced everything. Millions still know those who sacrificed themselves in the world war personally and remember them with compassion. This knowledge of the humanness of the individual personalities who perished will vanish more and more. What is typical of the most terrible and yet significant time of 1914 to 1918 will become stronger and more violent. The coming generation will see in a war memorial of the world war a holy symbol for the martyrdom of a new faith. This is a development which follows a similar path in all states of Europe. The grave of the "unknown soldier" in France, Italy and England, has often become a mere parade piece. Nevertheless they have simultaneously become for millions a mystical center analogous to the German war memorials to the undefeated German soldiers. An entire host of French clerical newspapers, for example, call this new worship which they observe with concern, un-Christian. They fear not without justice that the unknown soldier could replace the Saints. The infallible church once burnt Jean d'Arc and then made her into a saint. It will soon lay claims to the unknown soldier and make him Catholic. With consecrated water the church will falsify the meaning of a spiritual revolution which it senses today in just the same way as every other really Volkish manifes-

tation. It already did this in 1870-1871 when a worship of the heroic also set in. If Germany will really awaken, and on Sundays the village assemble, not around pillars of Mary, but around statues of the German field grey soldiers, then a crusade against this new pagan practice is certain as today the cross on the church tower.

The church has given every murdered missionary the stamp of a martyrdom and named him a saint. Even when Emmeran, represented by Christian tradition as a Jew, violated the daughter of the Bavarian duke and was therefore killed, the infallable church declared this disgraceful end as dying for the faith. Today Emmeran is a saint to whom prayers are uttered in pious Regensburg. But it is the duty of a coming German generation to mention with great respect only the names of those who in storm and wrack fought for the greatness and honor of the German people. We will honor them for what they are: martyrs of the Volkish faith. Here, in this corner of our soul lives the hope that the peoples of Europe will one day recognize the nature of the present frightful catastrophe. We hope that they will recognize the Volksfuhrer who is coming soon. We hope they will recognize what is most precious; the human blood of their nation. We hope they will become everywhere conscious that an application of the latter principle can be the only final solution. It is not found in heeding the call of any kind of "Christianity" or of liberal pacifism. It is true that these today form a strong power to control souls, Far more does the spirit.

Today the words prevail of the Roman legate Alexander: "We Romans will ensure that you Nordics slay each other and suffocate in your own blood." This was over 400 years ago. "Luther has lost the war," said Benedict XV, proudly, to the Jewish "historian" Emil Ludwig. Freemasonic humanity, with its deceitful shopkeeper pacifism, cannot provide the foundations of a real will. It cannot bring peace since capitalism motivates its actions. Only the recognition of honor in both friend and foe, in the unknown soldier outside, and in the dead undefeated field grey soldiers at home, is that germinal seed which is common today to the best elements of all still viable peoples. It has begun to sprout everywhere. Whether it will grow is the concern of the future. But one thing is already clear today. The inner man of honor will only mature when he has freed himself from the weeds which insolently proliferate today around him. All the degenerate forces are at work with all their power to prevent these martyrs for Volk honor from becoming the symbol of life for a more

beautiful German future. In the name of world peace and of so-called Christian humility they sow discord. Through deceitful pacifism they attempt to kill the real honor-conscious love of peace.

It lies within the life-feeling of a past epoch that it is a sin if a Catholic raised his hand against another Catholic. Later times regarded it as natural that monarchs had to stand together against republicans. The 19th century demanded that millions of workers not bear arms in the name of the state against the class comrades of another people. Reverence for the soldier who fought for the honor of his people is new. This feeling is in step with a new epoch. This new religion of Volk-honor can make Nordic-European consciousness awaken. It will not be awakened by common trade interests, after which the bastard Pan-Europeans go hawking today. One day stand in front of a confrontation with the black south and the Syrian parasites on a common front. Here the German must reach back to his magnificent heritage of mysticism so he can conquer and experience again the greatness of soul of a Meister Eckehart and so that this man and the field grey hero under the steel helmet become for us one and the same experience and myth. Then is the way open for the creation of a German Volk religion of the future for a real German Church, and for a united German Volk culture.

* * *

Against this background we must evaluate the meaning and work of love. As we concluded in the first book, love does not signify a type-creating strength. "One can only love the individual," said Goethe. It stands in the service of another value, humanism. The beneficiaries of this debilitating idea of love and humanism are the Roman Church and high finance, although they attempt to deny this fact. These powers are directed at subjugation of soul. We will confront these values with truthfulness. We will consciously place love beneath the type-creating power of honor. As a result love particularly subverts the character of upright, real and strong men. In place of the love which subjugates men we will formulate the new love of honor. Now comes what is most important. A German Volk Church will be voluntarily built on the idea of national and personal honor. It will automatically attach itself to only those persons who, irrespective of what church they belong to, are outwardly predominantly Nordic-conditioned. The same can be observed today with religious rebirth. A sacrificed love would, in this case, be an aid to the

cultivated aristocracy of soul, but it would also stand in the service of a rearrangement of the German people which would otherwise never be attained.

Now we may certainly also say that the love of Jesus Christ has been the love of one who is conscious of his aristocracy of soul and of his strong personality. Jesus sacrificed himself as a master, not as a servant. From the nobility of soul his great imitator, Meister Eckehart, also began. His love was given in the service of this value. It was likewise strong, conscious and thoroughly unsentimental. This love did not serve in "stuttering fear" as Ignatius demanded. It did not serve a system of soul slavery and racial destruction. It served solely honor-conscious freedom. And Meister Eckehart knew only too well, what he said, when shortly before his death, he wrote: "These three words, 'Free-Christian-German' are to the Pope and the Roman court nothing but mere poison, death, Devil and hell. They can neither suffer, see nor hear. Nothing else will come of it, that is certain." (*Wider das Papsttum in Rom vom Teufel gestiftet*, 1645.)

We can say something about the essence of the Teuton by analyzing his loyalty. Naturally we are not speaking of the corpse-like loyalty of Loyola, the loyalty to the self-chosen of the Lord. In fact in history many Teutons have chosen foreign masters and served them loyally as soldiers, philosophers, church teachers. Today we will describe these men not as loyal but as deserters. Only he is loyal who remains loyal to his own freedom. Many have been able to do this within the still not ossified church, even if almost all great men among them were threatened with prison, poison and dagger. Since the rule of Jesuitism no Nordic man can be consciously Germanic and simultaneously a follower of Loyola. "This above all: to thine own self be true" (Shakespeare, Hamlet), is alone valid if an inward and outward German rebirth is to take place. The "respect for ourselves," such as Goethe demanded and "to be one with oneself," as Meister Eckehart taught and lived—these are ideas of honor and freedom, loyalty and confirmation. Honor expresses itself in loyalty to oneself and one's race.

I believe that I know exactly which religious struggles will be incorporated as central ideas of a German national church. One thing I likewise believe I know. Hundreds of thousands have searched for decades for an announcement of the awakening of a really new feeling of life. Many men are tired of the old, flat mysticism and wish to go beyond individual experience to a community. Old forms have never been renewed in world

history by moving the content and form of the one essence into another already existing phenomenon. Both must be bridged by a visible synthesis.

One is indebted to the last work of H. S. Chamberlain. This book, *Mensch und Gott*, grasps clearly what is taking place. It is a search for a direct way to express the personality of Christ. Herder once demanded that the religion dedicated to Jesus should become a religion of Jesus. This was what Chamberlain strove for. A completely free man who disposed inwardly over the entire culture of our times, he has shown the deepest sensitivity for the superhuman simplicity of Christ. He represented Jesus as what he had once appeared to be: mediator between man and God.

In order to find one's way back to him, a great spiritual struggle must be fought. We do not wish to suffocate from untruths and thus perish miserably. We must cast aside alien prophets. We must seize those human hands which have given service to the elevation of the most beautiful qualities of the Germanic soul. The mythos of the Roman Representative of God must be overcome as so also we must overcome the mythos of literal sacredness in Protestantism. In the mythos of the Volk soul and honor lies a new binding and shaping middlepoint. To serve it is the duty of our generation. Only a later generation will found the new saving community.

* * *

If a statesman of the German future is to be able to face the religious stirrings of his people, without regard to his personal creed, he will have to use the greatest caution. If possible he must avoid every personal intrusion into these disputes. The schools also demand a completely different, positively demarcated, clear-aimed and very representative approach. The first task of education is not the mediation of technical knowledge but formation of character. It must strengthen racial values such as once slumbered in the Germanic essence. These values must be carefully cultivated upwards. The national state must lay claim to sole control of schools without compromise. State controlled schools must educate soil-rooted citizens of state. The citizenry must become aware of what they are fighting for in life. The citizenry must understand the totality of values that are theirs irrespective of any individual features.

The enormous and unique intellectual chaos of present day life is the consequence of the unbridled struggle of dozens of systems of thought for

predominance. One system represents the bloodless-humanistic system which gazes back into the past. Its systematic schooling of memory has throttled the real impetus of life. The realistic school pays tribute to the *Zeitgeist* of liberalist technology. Recently, it has made increasingly strong attempts to help the church to snatch the superintendance of schools back to Rome.

We have thus many school types. These systems are founded on different supreme values. There are the denominational schools which, in all seriousness, still wish to teach geography and mathematics on the basis of their Old Testament revelations. They must angrily admit that there is falsehood in their religious representation of Jehovah, their idea of creation out of nothing and the fable of Noah's Ark. The famed 6,000 years since the world creation began is contradicted by the eternity of the universe. We know now that millions of years were required for earthly formation. The establishment of the principle of free research has cost us the best blood of Europe. Still, today, the Roman church still preaches against such freedom of research. The church still teaches many things that already have been overcome by the understanding. Nonetheless, the Roman church still holds to these "eternal truths," in spite of natural science as taught by scholars. This proves only one thing. It is part of the Nordic character to do research for truth or knowledge that governs actions. We are also inwardly disposed to reject dogmatic systems hostile to us. The host of Roman church scientists follow only one purpose, namely, making natural science, in fact all science, serviceable to the old superstitions. These had been smashed to pieces once and for all through Copernicus. Thus the Jesuit Hammerstein asserted that the Church had acted fully in accordance with its right when it did not permit the use of the concept of race in natural history. He taught that history was not derived from tribal elders, since, as a result, the revealed doctrine of hereditary sin would collapse (*Kirche und Staat*, p.131). The ancient story of Adam and Eve has thus been quite openly elevated into a measure for all research! And recently Pope Pius XI expressly decreed at the beginning of the year 1930, in an Encyclical concurred with by the Vatican Council, that "healthy reason" was only present in man only to prove the truth of the faith which had been laid down forever. The church is thus only logical when it stands against academic freedom. It recognizes only a representation of world causation and human essence which have been laid down by the doctrine of revelation.

The position of the Roman church is seen most clearly in the world picture it presents in the instruction in history. For this, more than every

other evaluation, is not an arranging of factualities. Roman history denies all its falsifications. It is self-evident that the Roman church condemns every real historical nationalism. This is logical, for the abuse and misuse of history is a means to certain purposes.

That Luther was a degenerate rascal is taken as self-evident to all Roman Catholic teachers in all states. Canisius knows of the "most repulsive debauchery" which Luther permitted. The Evangelical faithful have become "plague-ridden men." The Jesuit work *Imago primi saeculi* declares Luther to be a "world monster and incurable plague." Pope Urban VIII calls him a "dispicable monster." So it goes on up to the present day. It is completely false to merely loudly complain about this, without understanding the Roman system in its core. "It is a sad state of things for a science which has nothing else to offer other than eternal searching for truth." This truly "sublime" sentence of the Innsbruck Professor Joseph Donat (for futher details, see Hoensbruck, *Der Jesuitordern*) reveals the lowest depths of an anti-European world of spirit, against which everything which was true and great has fought and bled.

The Old Testament and its "scientific truths" have been proven false. Put together by Roman historical representatives, they are admittedly threadbare. This is true to such an extent that even any second year student could unveil these lies today. The continued domination of the Roman doctrinal principles shows how little man is determined by insight alone. It shows how strongly will, instinct and imaginative power can take effect. The Roman system turns with all its power at these qualities of the human soul. The Jesuit Order is the tested tool to force the anxious ego into its service through the imaginative power. The Jesuit Order blinds the future to things that, ordinarily, every honest man can discover on his own. The entire apparatus of the Roman Church is active from the cradle to the grave in gaining mastery over our imaginative powers. It permits no pause to appear in this search for influence. It uses the magic of the sacraments. It extends its influence by creating sense-confusing forms. For this purpose it also uses the power of the confessional.

Only Liberalism with its dissolving effect has hitherto confronted this closed system. Liberalism is an unhappy consequence of the scientific breakthrough by the Nordic soul of Roger Bacon by way of Leonardo, Galileo, and Copernicus. But beyond the demand for freedom of research Liberalism has not thrust through to a positive core. In the final analysis principles determined how much freedom in teaching was to be permitted in the liberal era. It taught the dogma that everyone is basically the same. It holds that all classes represent a barrier that hampers development.

Science without prerequisites is today approaching a tragic end. It had itself created the most unwholesome prerequisites to our racial decline. The interpretation of world history outlined at the beginning as racial history is the present day renunciation of this declaiming doctrine of humanism. The idea of German renewal confronts the Roman and Liberal as a clearly conscious demand on its own. It denies apparent knowledge without prerequisites. It combats the hysteria-breeding summoning up of the imaginative power. It consciously recognizes the spiritual and racially conditioned will. It demands the evaluation of past and present according to the judgement of this sole culture-creating will. We must ask if the will has been strengthened or weakened through historical events or personalities. We no longer ask today whether Adam's "hereditary sins" were conditioned through knowledge. We do not inquire whether the greatness of Frederick the Great is not measured in history but whether he and his deeds were milestones on the way to German greatness. Our present generation, facing the facts in all honesty, demands a new evaluation of our past. We must re-evaluate both what is political and what is culture-history. From this also, the rejection of the hitherto customary teaching freedom unrestricted for all professions in all directions resulted. Freedom of research naturally remains as an irreplaceable conquest in the struggle against Syria and Rome in all domains. History also, even the weaknesses of our great men, must not be quieted. What rises over and beyond, the eternal, mythical, must be felt out and shaped with a searching soul. Then a new succession of spirits will arise from Odin, Siegfried, Widukind, Friedrich III, the Hohenstaufen, Eckehart, Walther von der Vogelweide, Luther, Frederick the Great, Bach, Goethe, Beethoven, Schopenhauer, Bismarck and their Germanic counterparts. Far removed from this spiritual-racial line of German soul-development stand Instistoris, Canisius, Ricardo, Marx, Lasker, and Rathenau. To serve this new evaluation is the calling of the schools in the coming German Reich. It is their noblest, if not sole, task in the coming decades. We must work until this evaluation has become a matter of course for all Germans. But the schools still await a great teacher of German history with the will to a German future. He will come when Mythos has become life.

* * *

If, as a result, German evaluation of the past stands in general hostility to the Roman and Jewish-Liberal, then the evaluation of great individual men must be adjusted accordingly. Here, in protection of the great Ger-

mans, lies the most important right of the Volkish state to intrude into the school system. One must be clear about this. The Roman ideological system places its emphasis outside all Volkish values. The Nordic system must also perceive the greatest embodiment of the nation, the genius, in a completely special light. It will only noticeably touch those who are alienated from our spiritual commands. The Jesuit writer Meyer represents Immanual Kant, undoubtedly the most sublime teacher of the idea of duty, as a "source of moral as well as of religious corruption in state and society." His colleague in the Jesuit Order, H. Hoffmann, declares that Kant "in no way" solved the task of establishing true science. In this respect, it is entertaining to hear such words from the mouths of representatives of a world outlook which has suppressed all science wherever it had sufficient power at its disposal. Even more consistent is the Jesuit S. Kempf who preaches that, "Kant shattered confidence in our thinking capacity." Completely clear is the leading Jesuit S. Pesch, who is so arrogant as to compare Kant with a "pestilential breath" which has poisoned the entire life of the nation. His thought is "deceit and humbug." The Jesuit Cathrien emphasized that Kant's doctrine of morality undermines the foundation of every moral order. Jesuit Brors attempted to convince Germans that scarcely another man has so harmed "our Fatherland" as Kant. According to Pater Duhr, who is revered by all deluded Catholics, the Kantian "virtuous hero is nothing other than a moral Nihilist." Duhr argued that a systematic work of thought must break the "magic of Kant" and destroy the *Weltanschauung* of the "repellant, decrepit old man of Konigsberg."

Roman Church writers see in Martin Luther a "blemish on the face of Germany," an "Epicurean pig" and an "infamous apostate." They even call him a "filthy sow," a "violator of nuns" and "pig's snout." (Vetter, S.J.) This may be passed over in view of the conditions of conflict in the church, but it is shattering to have to affirm that, up to our own times, leading church writers have occupied themselves with the besmirching of Goethe.

Maschler, a leading Jesuit, fulminates against Goethe's "heathen godles literature." He recommended a "national education" against the so-called great "classicists." Jesuit Doss is infuriated at the view that there would be no culture if one were not familar with Goethe and Schiller. He says the "mask would be snatched away from the idol" and this would shatter Goethe and "even many more idols."

Most furious of all is the impetus provided by the greatest art critic of the Jesuit order, the Swiss Baumgarten, who sent forth into the world two

despicable pamphlets directed against German literature. In the eyes of this gentleman Schiller is a "Bread literateur" who hunts around "for spicy historical material in order to fill his 'Revue' and to earn his fee." Goethe appears in these pamphlets as a highly mediocre collector of fragments. All that Baumgarten has understood of *Faust* is that his "entire brooding and striving" revolves around Gretchen and Helena. Goethe's other poetry is directed at "the glorification of the most ordinary earthly impulses. . .foolish theatrical adventures. . .sensual search for pleasure" by this "egoistic demi-god," this "secretive spirit" who signifies a danger for religion and morality. As a result the Jesuits draw the conclusion that Goethe's writings actually ought to be restricted in circulation. The schools may not participate in the "Goethe cult." Let it be said, "instead of ceaseless weighty pronouncements, openly to youth how low Goethe stands as a man, how hollow and superficial his *Weltanschauung*, how immoral and depraved his principles of life were. . ." (Baumgarten.) "Youth and men will no longer take Werther, Wilhelm Meister and Faust as types of real German spirit but as poetical shapes of a morally very degenerate time." In this manner, as equally narrow minded as degenerate, the greatest cultural strength becomes, under Jesuitical fingers, the "one time market crier of Pfundersweiler. Indeed, Weimer in general, is, for the Jesuit Diehl "a puddle of filth."

This entire struggle is directed instinctively, consciously and unequivocally, through centuries of training, according to plan against the great type-linked personalities of a Volk, to extinguish within the Volk the guiding stars of its life and to rob it of its own ideals and to constrict the flow of its organic life-strength. The words of the Jesuit General Nickel from the 17th century, that a national spirit was an alien, evil minded, plague-bringing wind, are, today, the basic conviction not only of Jesuitism but of the Roman Church in general. Even in face of the national awakening they are not always able to see it through.

The national spirit declared Nickel in a circular letter to his entire order on November 16, 1656, a few years after ending of the 30 Years War, "is the sworn and bitterest enemy of our society. We should shy back from it with all our soul, with all our heart. . .this pestilential spirit be rooted out. You should make efforts to do this through implorings and admonishments." At the end of the 19th century the renowned Roman Catholic writer. Cathrein, declared: "With the most infamous achievements of our times belongs the principle of nationality." In the Years of Salvation, 1920-1928, German Nationalism was described by Cardinal Faulhaber as the "greatest heresy." The Catholic Congress in Constance in 1923 and

the Roman and German printed press all agreed. The Munich clergyman, Dr. Monius, under the protection of his superiors, rounded off this viewpoint in one sentence: "Catholicism breaks the backbone of every Nationalism."

Today the unerring powers of soul confront these disintegrating forces, so that steps can also be taken for overcoming this racial chaos. We must never, not for a moment, forget that everything, yes, everything, which we understand as Volkish civilization in the widest sense had to be wrung from these forces in centuries long struggle. The reason for the alarm of the creators of racial chaos and their organizations is understandable. I say everything, down to the roots, in the Mother Tongue.

In the precepts of the Jesuits we read: "The use of the mother tongue in all things governing schools is never permitted. . ." Wherever this most delicate stirring of a Volk soul makes itself perceptible, Rome has opposed it, brutally when it was in power. It was seemingly yielding and tolerant when it felt itself weak. When Rome later had to reduce its demands, the Order attempted, in 1830, to at least eliminate poetry (!) and that at a time when the German Classics already existed and Goethe was close to the grave. In 1832, after 250 years of struggle, the arrangement of studies of the Jesuits permitted the teaching of the mother tongue, but under constraints, in order not to be completely pushed out. But here we must remark that, as Hoensbroech affirms, the latest official edition of the *Statutes* (Florence 1892/93) also contain the proper arrangement of studies. It has not accepted the improvements of 1832. Thus, officially, the Order of 1599 still rightly exists. Condordats, Reich School Laws, etc., are therefore destined to transform the German School system into a breeding center, a melting pot of races. The leading Jesuit Duhr allowed these words to escape: "This remains a permanent principle: practicing of the mother tongue is to be recommended. A special school subject must not be made out of it. . ."

These examples show the necessity of making uncompromising decisions in the school question. Despite practicing tolerance towards forms of faith no German statesman has the right to hand over the education of youth to a church. The consequence of this capitulation would be, at first, appearing cautiously, then increasingly stronger, the denigration of the great personalities of the German Volkhood. That would be synonymous with the devaluation of the creators of our culture, in so far as the latter have not stood in service of a church. The support of Catholic educational demands by Protestantism shows, that the latter, heeding

only its domains, is not conscious of the danger it represents for the whole of Germany. Lutheranism has represented Catholic Church interests blindly against the German.

Man is nothing in himself. He is a personality only insofar as he is fitted intellectually and spiritually into an organic ancestral succession of thousands of generations. To strengthen and confirm this consciousness and hence cultivate the will, to allow others to inherit the experienced values, to fight for the whole—those things are the tasks of the state. Only by following this creed can we educate real citizens. To give a metaphysical foundation to our primordial feelings, to console the faulty and to strengthen the soul, those things must be the task of the churchman. That task demands highest humanity. It is so demanding that it can also fill the life of the greatest personality. The preachers of every denomination are often impelled by the desire to make their ideas dominant over the whole. One may not expose these men to the temptation of seeking to influence the total vision of the Volk citizen. This is even less to be the case if, among them, representatives of systems are found, who in principle, are concerned with denigrating the great men of Germany.

All other school disputes and problems, however important they are, can be disregarded here. Only by way of summary can this much be said: the present day dispute about school has the same cause as the political conflicts. We no longer have a picture of what is German. The product of all the old parties could therefore never be a German school but only an uncreative compromise between Catholicism, Protestantism and Jewish-Liberalism. It could only spiritually split the people.

The conflict over schools has certainly revealed most clearly of all the total collapse of our times. Simultaneously it has also proved the justification of the Germanic ideal which cannot compromise but demands its own supremacy. Creeds are not a purpose in themselves. They are a changeable means to be used in the service of the vital nationalist feeling and of the Germanic character values. If they are not this, then this condition proves the sickness of the Volk soul.

Creeds have hitherto been templates which made efforts to imprint their spiritual essences onto the vital essences of the peoples. All spiritual battles have resulted from the competition of these value systems. The conflict of ideologies will not cease unless the peoples vanish along with their conscious values. Either the church creeds have triumphed or the Volkish existence will force its biological laws upon the churches. In the first case one can abandon every life-form that is true to racial type. In the second case a real civilization will begin.

The rejection of the Germanistic idea in Germany is a naked betrayal of the Volk. A later time will place this crime on the same level as betrayal of the country during the war. It is therefore no wonder that the parties which committed the national betrayal of 1918, have also written betrayal of the Volk on their black and red flags.

The prerequisite of every German education is the recognition of the fact that it is not Christianity which has brought us civilization but that Christianity has to thank Germanic character for its lasting values. This is a reason why, in many states, it does not reveal these values. The Germanic character values are eternal, according to which everything else has to adjust itself. Whoever does not wish that, abandons a German rebirth and utters his own sentence of death. But a man or a movement which wishes to aid these values to achieve total victory possesses the moral right not to spare opponents. They have the duty to overcome them spiritually, to cause them to perish organizationally and to keep them politically powerless. For if a power-impulse does not emanate from a culture-will, then it should not begin a struggle at all.

VI. A New System of State

The great world revolution which began in August, 1914, overthrew the old gods and idols. This revolution has not only overturned the spiritual and political life of every people, but it also wiped away forever the frontiers of the pre-war era. The provisional rulings in Versailles, which, in June, 1919, were recognized by representatives of an anti-German subservience as the binding law of the Weimar republic, did not hinder, but hastened, the flood which shaped the world anew. The forcible reduction in German living space impressed upon all Germans with a fateful power their primordial life-problem compelling a final solution. Out of liberal cowardice our leaders refused to recognize this before 1914, and, with the shortsightedness of tradesmen the whole of Germany was turned into a single machine. In every land where many factory chimneys reached into the sky, these were more numerous than the trees. This was done in order to feed the growing hungry millions, but it was done without a serious thought of conquering farmland for them where they could grow their own bread. The questions of living space and bread were solved earlier by the Saxons with the sword. This weapon was swung before the plow. The later internationalized descendants of these knights and peasants forgot, in preaching the "economic permeation" of the world, that they would not be there if they had not been the beneficiaries of the German sword.

Today a game of subterfuge no longer helps. No weak allusion to "inward re-settlement" served as our salvation. Little was altered in the total destiny of the nation. Today only the will to create space for millions of Germans, transformed into a conscious goal, is of aid. This demands character. This demands the recognition that as long as France commands political power against us there can be no flowering of the German people. This tension can only be resolved by a far-sighted European policy. If Germany abandons the ideas of space and political freedom, then East Prussia will sink in a bloody swamp. Then, from east and west, the enemy will draw ever closer to the heart of the Germanic essence. The first demand of a German policy will consist in the promotion of a true peace over and against the anti-peace Treaty of Versailles and its consequences. That will also reveal the impetus for readiness for understanding among the other peoples.

From a racial-political aspect it is therefore important to emphasize that the type determining French life today has almost no relationship to the type of ancient France. It must be regarded as the descendant of another racial stratum, the eastern-round-headed, as compared with the earlier Nordic-western-long-skulled one. The Frenchman Vacher de Lapouge has already established this. He came to the conclusion that the kind of disposition among the present day French is completely different from that of the past. "This reveals itself," says Lapouge, "in the smallest details. It suffices to compare the poetry of Tingeltangels, a true negro poetry, with the *Volk* poetry of the Middle Ages, in order to make clear the spiritual retreat." Further, "It is the first time in history, that a round-headed race has attained rule. The future alone can instruct how this remarkable attempt will develop." The ideas of Democracy are the ideas of the eastern race which was earlier ruled by the Nordic race to which the Northern French, Germans and Slavs belong. These eastern forces openly triumphed in 1789 and 1871 in France, and 1918 in Germany. The struggle for German renewal is a struggle for the re-establishment of the validity of the Germanic heroic idea over and against democractic shopkeeper ideas. It is a struggle for the European racial strength and its freedom. The best of each people has cause, solely out of self-preservation, to take up the same struggle within the confines of its own *Volkhood.*

Thanks solely to the policy of the French parliament threatening the West with the aid of the whole of Africa, present day political Paris appears as a danger of first rank to the whole of Europe. When the Greek

states once feuded, they fetched over new slave hosts from Asia Minor and Africa. By these slaves, rather than by internecine struggle, did Hellas' nations perished.

This alien-blooded intrusion was then paired with the vanishing of Nordic blood in Rome and with the ideas of a raceless world empire. Today, after the chaos of the world war and the ideas of world revolution, the idea of a raceless Pan Europe arises.

The most vociferous preacher of this idea, Graf Couvenhove-Kalergi, is part "European" and part Japanese. He is thus a suitable man to announce the old demand for an epoch of decline and for a raceless united state. The Pan Europe movement recognizes the present status quo, in plain words, it recognizes the predominance of France and its small eastern allies over an awakening Europe. Pan Europe should be called in reality: Franco-Judaea. In this connection Pan Europe rejects England but draws in Indo-China and all the African colonies of France.

Europe's states have all been founded and preserved by Nordic men. Nordic man has been partly disintegrated and partly eliminated by alcohol, world war and Marxism. It is clear that the White race cannot maintain its position in the world if it has not created order in Europe. As a result, a demand arises which is felt a millionfold as necessary and which explains the successes of the Pan European propaganda: the securing of the European continent through a national foreign policy. From this originally correct idea, however, the exactly converse conclusions results. In order to preserve Europe, the sources of Nordic strength in Europe must be brought alive again, strengthened. This includes Germany, Scandinavia, Finland and England. Conversely, the influence of France, which in the south is already completely Mulatto-ized, must be halted so that it can no longer act as an advance area for the Africans. Presently, this is the case and in increasing measure. It is necessary that the Nordic kingdoms mentioned, in addition to the U.S.A., recognize the prerequisite of their own powerful existence. This would also make unnecessary an otherwise unavoidable conflict between the republic of the onward marching black-white France and Nordic Germany. It will leave the former to its self-chosen fate, without having threatened and poisoned the whole of Europe.

Moreover, a France with more insight would have the power to make itself healthy. Admittedly it can no longer do this on the basis of its onetime Nordic traditions, but it certainly can do this in accordance with its Alpine-western racial back-ground. In terms of natural biological necessity France has abandoned racial predominance in Europe. If it were

to allow Poland, Czechoslovakia and others of the so-called Little Entente to drop away, and if it took in hand a policy of the exclusion of Negroes and Jews, and if it established a frontier conditioned by its own population, then France could also have its own culture unhindered by Germany, and it would be a strong factor in European politics. The "hundred million Frenchmen" admittedly ensure France the cheap fame of a temporary domination, but they also guarantee racial and State decline in the future. Can France still manage to meet such a test in a rational manner? This is the great question which no one wishes to try to answer.

"Pan Europe" as an organic foreign political fact can only exist after limiting the circle of effect around individual countries.

The "meaning of history" has not proceeded throughout from east and west. Rather, it has rhythmically alternated. Once Nordic Europe sent out fruitful waves of peoples which created states and cultures in India, Persia, Hellas and Rome. Then, the eastern races infiltrated, seeping into Europe. They extended their rule into present southern Europe. Then the Mongol and Turkish swarms moved over European fields. The present collapse has offered a new feeling of life which will extend its effect. External compulsion supports this necessary alternation of direction. "From west to east" is the direction from the Rhine up to the Weichsel. "From west to east," it must resound from Moscow to Tomsk. The "Russian" whom Peter the Great and the Empress Catherine cursed, was real. Europe should not have been forced upon him. He must be satisfied with transferring his focal point to Asia. Only in this manner will he perhaps attain an inward equilibrium and not contort in false humility or lay arrogant claim to speak for Europe which he alleges has lost its way, After elimination of the mixture of Babeuf, Blanc, Bakunin, Tolstoy, Lenin and Marx—called Bolshevism—he should utter these words not to the west but to the east where there is space for it. In Europe there is no longer room for it.

There will be no raceless and *Volkless* "Central Europe" such as Naumann announced, and no Franco-Jewish Pan Europe. Nordic Europe will be the watchword of the future along with a German central Europe. Germany will be race and national state. It will be the central power of the continent, insuring the south and the south-east. The Scandinavian states and Finland will be a second league. They will secure the North-east along with Great Britain and guard the West and the overseas in those places where it is necessary to do so in the interests of Nordic man. This demands a foundation which reaches still further.

We need to state one final fundamental demarcation. There exists today with justice a strong defence of Nationalism against Pan-European multi- or internationalism. A strong systematic current describes this as the defence of the Western spirit. This "Western spirit" is, essentially, nothing other than the mingling of the later France with the Jewish democratic ideas. These have found their political reflection in present day parliamentary systems. One should not speak abstractly of the rule of a so-called "West" but much more palpably of a Jewish-French system of ideas.

The political development of England, for example, has proceeded in a completely different way to that of France, and, whoever knows even a little of English history knows that England, during the course of centuries, in spite of its so-called popular representation, has been ruled in a thoroughly aristocratic manner. The interesting link between aristocracy and a personal lack of national concern was conditioned through the security of the surrounding sea. These factors have determined English life. Only in recent times with industrialization and the rule of finance capital has the French-Jewish sickness infested the English. Italy has also been under this spell for decades. But it stands now in the sharpest contradiction to democratic ideas. Many democratic ideas including Bank Capitalism remain despite the beginning of Fascism.

The "Eastern spirit" stands in stark contrast to our western declarations. Many who have our western values have unwittingly succumbed to this systematic "Eastern spirit." A great number of nationalist Germans also confess their belief in the western spirit without possessing deeper notions of this eastern spirit. The entire East is diversified throughout. One will need to speak here of the Russian character which stands in contrast to the germanized peoples of Finland, Estonia and Lithuania. Poland has also developed its strongly outlined peculiarities. Inside Russia a host of oriental peoples struggle against the traditional forms of the germanized State.

These movements of racial chaos can only be completely understood in connection with the Bolshevist movement. It is no accident if their Tartar-Kalmucks like Lenin, Jews like Trotsky and Caucasians like Stalin alternately attain power. The Ukrainian south adopts the sharpest defensive position against Greater Russia. With a population of seven million it offers an autonomous group of weighty importance. To disregard all these currents, often very different in composition of blood, by applying to them the schematic words "Eastern spirit" and to then introduce this bloodless description into practical politics—these things would signify the destruction of all organic attempts at a German foreign policy.

Things have even gone so far that a writer describing himself as Nationalist has declared that Germany's mission consists in the spreading of the Asiatic-eastern spirit. "Even if East Prussia were lost, Germany's mission would be fulfilled if Asia ruled from Vladivostock to the Rhine." Such ideas come to men who attempt, with bloodless construction, to approach vital questions of the people.

Our mission is thus. One group in Germany declares that one must realize Nationalism. Another answers, only after the former Marxist parties had betrayed Socialism. A new movement is summoned to realize Socialism. There now exists no abstract Nationalism just as there exists no abstract Socialism. The German people is not there in order to defend any kind of abstract schema with its blood. Conversely, all schemas, systems of ideas and values are in our eyes only a means to strengthen the life struggle of the nation outwardly. They must enhance our inner strength through a just and purposeful organization. We have therefore to welcome Nationalism when it arises tied to definite inward values of our people only. We must ensure that the powers of our lines of destiny do not arrive in hostile contrast with the components of the German *Volk*. Thus, an enthusiasm for Nationalism may be able to bring about a movement of renewal. We can affirm that, for example, the South Africans of mixed race or those mixed race in the East Indies also make "Nationalist" revolutions. The blacks of Haiti and San Domingo experienced a Nationalist awakening. Under the slogan of self-determination peoples of all inferior elements on this earth completely and systematically lay claims to freedom for themselves. All this interests us either not at all or only insofar as a far-sighted German policy promises to strengthen what is Germanic. Within this Germanic awakening, a strengthening of the German people is possible.

* * *

Today the entire world looks tensely towards the Far East with a very correct feeling. There, many thousand kilometers distant from Europe, events are taking place which nevertheless touch our own destiny directly. In the Chinese struggle against the white race, even if at first directed principally against the Anglo-Saxons, we see the most outstanding characteristic of an anti-European movement as it spreads through the entire world. We can establish that, after the world war, the Blacks appeared with a completely different self-confidence than they had at the time when they were placed under the English and French flags. In many

points of Africa secret political societies arose which operated with the aim of conquering the whole of Africa for the Blacks.

In America a similar movement is in progress led by Garvey and Dubois. At Black congresses the expulsion of the Whites from the whole of Africa as a political goal is planned completely openly. A similar movement can be identified among the Egyptians. At present the Egyptian movement is suppressed by England energetically. So it is also with the freedom movement of the Indians.

Without question India is in a great state of change, undergoing enormous fermentation. The Indian, in accordance with his temperament, at first conducts the struggle purely defensively. The leader of Young India, Mahatma Gandhi, declares again and again that he does not think of a violent revolution against England. However, alongside him an activist wing is at work, at first under the leadership of Das, then under the direction of the National-Bolshevist pundit Nehru. The latter seems to be getting the upper hand. The possibility of an upsurge of many hundreds of millions of Indians is thoroughly established. The Dutch government, for its part, has already had to supress dangerous uprisings in their colonies on Java. These rebellions involved many natives. But the entire anti-European struggle has appeared most clearly of all in the Chinese rebellion which was led with the strongest of energy by many millions.

The seething movement among the Black peoples is a direct consequence of the world war. On the shoulders of the directors of the Entente Powers is the monstrous crime of having mobilized blacks and the racially-mixed against the German people. After having insulted Germany for decades in many ways, the Allies threw the insult by making war against a Reich of the White race. The greatest and most direct guilt undoubtedly involves France. After the war France occupied the Rhineland, the cradle of Europe's culture, using black troops. The military delegates in the French parliament quite openly declared that the French were a "people of a hundred million" and did not have at their disposal two armies, one White and one Black, but "a single army." With this programmatic declaration French policy has equated the Black race with the White and, as 140 years ago when France introduced the emancipation of the Jews, so it stands today at the head of the bastardization of Europe through the Blacks. It will, if this goes further, scarcely still be regarded as a European State, but rather as a forerunner of Africa, led by Jews.

After November, 1918, England believed that it had completely achieved its war aims. The German colonies were stolen. The whole of German private property in all countries was confiscated by the Allies.

The German merchant fleet was hastily handed over by the pathetic 'heroes' of November, 1918. The German battle fleet lay sunken under the waters in Scapa Flow. Economically, a defeated Germany no longer offered any competition. As a slave of the Entente nations it had to provide forced labor for decades. Nevertheless, it is true today that Great Britain has not only not won this war but that it approaches the gravest convulsions throughout its entire Empire.

The participation of the British colonies and of the so-called Dominions in the world war against Germany had enormously increased the self-confidence of the South Africans, Canadians and Australians. Just as once the United States separated from England, so the separatist forces in the so-called Dominions are today much strengthened. London can only avoid the disintegration of the British Empire by agreeing pliably to all the wishes for self-government by the Dominions. England today is actually no longer a centrally directed state. It is really a league of states. The forces unleashed under the slogan of self-determination are no longer to be controlled. Admittedly, the Jewish city, in league with the Liberal and Labor parties, could cherish the hope of striking a favorable business agreement with Jewish-Bolshevist Moscow. The unconcealed Bolshevist activity in England has, as consequence, developed a sudden defensive action by the entire people, including the British workers. The Liberal-Jewish attempts have always been energetically rejected. The strong anti-Bolshevist current within the Conservative party pushed England into an ever stronger policy hostile to Moscow. Moscow, for its part, under the pressure of historical necessity, as it were, had to bring into effect its strength in the east. Earlier, Bolshevism, in the hope of dragging all Europe with it, had made efforts to overrun principally Germany, and, with it, all Central Europe, by force. Thanks to the energetic strength of German resistance and, in part, also by Poles and Hungarians, this assault was warded off initially. But since Soviet Bolshevism could not be inactive politically, unless it wished to abandon the slogan of world revolution forever, then it had to test its powers in another direction. Here it struck first at Turkey, which at the beginning utilized an alliance with Moscow. Then later it released itself more and more from Bolshevism and can today be regarded as a resolute national state. Thus nothing other was left to Moscow than to send out feelers further to the East, into Mongolia, Manchuria and even further to South China.

In China the preaching of the social revolution won support in circles of the exploited Chinese proletariat. When one knows the terrible conditions of the Chinese working class then one will grasp that to these many

millions, Moscow appears as the main fighter for a better standard of life. This social-revolutionary current linked itself with a nationalist, anti-European revolutionary propaganda, for which the Chinese intellectuals had already prepared for decades. The name of Canton embodies these currents. They comprise the self-reliance of China and the expulsion of all Europeans. This is the general situation which the European powers under England's leadership confront in China. In order to grasp the great struggle in its depth, there must be some brief references to the forces at work in the past.

One may evaluate China and its life-forms as one will, but it is a fact that in spite of different racial contrasts, China, in differentiation from partitioned Europe, was created from a single spiritual center. Philosophy, religion, morality, State doctrine and life corresponded organically to one another. China has had the luck, irrespective of certain popular views, to be able to develop a culture to its primal forms again and again. In spite of the fluid teaching of Taoism, Buddhism penetrated from outside but changed very little. China and Confucius are ideal essences coinciding with race and people.

Confucius embodied the Chinese spirit in the most complete way. He is the teacher, the saint and the statesman all in one. There therefore exists a Confucian religion just as a Confucian state. If one understands this then one can see its significance and compare it to European states where the ideas of *Volk* and State have feuded with the ideas of the church for centuries. This, then, is the reason for the inner strength of China. The characteristic of the Chinese ideal is that it first adopts an attitude of reserve toward metaphysical speculations. It also energetically rejects every extremist doctrine of a moral nature. The securely formal, extremely polite, correct and learned gentleman has been the ideal of the whole of China irrespective of the fact that, under this, enormously strong passions often slumbered. The work by the Confucian Chungyung, *Book of the Proportioned Middle*, expressed in its title exactly what the great teacher wished for. One should choose no great sorrow and no great joy, one should help people, foster love of peace, practice justice, be parsimonious and work zealously in society through setting a good example for virtue.

That which is "noble" is that which is the ideal of Confucius. Just as he taught so is he also said to have lived. In the *Conversations,* Confucius is exhaustively described by his adherents. With lesser officials he spoke in a "correct manner," with higher ones "softly but determinedly." In the presence of a prince he showed "respectful unease." In performance of

his services he was zealous in keeping strictly to the ceremonial. During eating and in bed he did not speak. He also sacrificed when he had only a small amount of food. He sat only upon a correctly rolled mat. He showed the highest esteem toward old age. In short, whether pilgrim or minister, Confucius always remained the same in bearing and discipline. This Chinese racial discipline had attained consciousness in one man, Confucius. It has proven to have an enormous type-forming power. This power has been continuously effective through two centuries. The Chinese people were in the real sense a *Volk* because they possessed an all-determining true-to-type ideal. One fact cannot escape our attention: The Chinese state of over three hundred million people has revered one type not only in words, but in life. All attacks on unity paled against Confucianism. This system had been systematically supported by significant philosophers who truly believed in the message.

Lao-Tse may seem greater to us than Confucius. Nevertheless he passes beyond the mild medium of his rival. He sought the primal metaphysical ground of being, which he found in *Tao*, that is, in the sense of the "right path" to world-reason. Confucius also used the word *Tao*. However, he guarded against drawing the same conclusions as Lao-Tse. The latter's teaching was a work for illuminated spirits, whereas Confucius wished to give the broad masses path and form. So he triumphed over Lao-Tse. Confucius emphasized that he wished to bring nothing new. He only wished to revere and purify the old since it had been neglected. In this doctrine he showed directly from the beginning that he laid great weight on tradition. That was something which the ancestor-honoring Chinese has always respected. One proof of consistency is seen in the directive that makes the father responsible for the deeds of his son. For this reason, a personality which has provided significant services is ennobled along with the forefathers who made that life possible. On the other side, Confucius punished not only an ill-doer but also his father. This fact again shows how the personal is not only systematically suppressed in favor of the typical. Indeed it is disregarded. All this shows an enormous capacity for spiritual tenacity which crystallizes around an average idea. This is certainly a contrast to the true Nordic European who considers every case to be individually unique, organic and therefore worthy of examination.

Into this closed Chinese world came a Western-trading, intruding Imperialism in the 19th century. It was linked with missionary activity which was as energetic as it was unjustified. Calico and opium, waste products of Europe, infiltrated into China. These things destroyed first of

all the equilibrium of Chinese life in the harbor cities. Later they penetrated deeper into the land. Over-awed at the Western technical greatness, even the cultured Chinese decorated their dwellings with the stale trash of the great warehouses of the European West. They sent their sons to Europe and America in order to learn the new wisdom there. The young Chinese were infected by economic subjectivism and personalized European thought. Their liberal activity then contributed its share to the present disintegration of China. But protests were felt. The Boxer uprisings were only the most brutal symptoms of this.

The Chinese and later the Japanese intelligentsia headed a movement which aimed at the racial renewal and liberation of the East. The Japanese writer Unosuke Wakamyia wrote that the new Greater Asia movement pursued the purpose of securing Asiatic culture and economy from European intrusions. The program of the Asia-Gi-Kwai Society likewise demanded the uprising of all Asiatics. Count Okuma founded the Pan-Asiatic Society after the Russo-Japanese war. In his speeches he spoke of the coming decay of Europe. The 20th century he thought would witness the ruin of the Western states. In 1907 he elaborated the idea through the "Indo-Japanese Society" that the eyes of India were directed hopefully at Japan. This idea was substantiated by the *Taimin*, a newpaper in Osaka, which demanded Japanese help in revolutionizing of India. Professor Kambe of the University of Kyoto saw in Japan the leading state in the coming, unavoidable conflict with Europe.

In the year 1925 the great world revolution began in the East. The Western powers had to force Japan to its knees in order to complete their world domination. For this they needed a defeated China. Simultaneously, Bolshevism ignited the social revolution. As never before the instincts slumbering in China were awakened. China today has lost its mythical type-forming ideal.

Hundreds of self-seeking rivals were incited by foreign powers to make war against each other. Existing disputes can not be overcome in the name of the Confucian ideal. They can be stirred up by new, foreign slogans. Modern liberal anarchism also disintegrates the Chinese type. The most weighty upheaval whose outcome cannot be predicted is in progress. But if what we see does not deceive us, the bloody conflict will end with the expulsion of Europe from East Asia. It is inevitable that both missionaries and opium dealers and other dubious adventurers will have to leave China. It was not in the name of necessary protection that the white race broke into China but in the service of profit-seeking by Jewish traders. As a result the white race has dishonored itself. It has

disintegrated an entire culture and precipitated a just rebellion against itself. China fights for its myth, for its race and its ideals. This is just what the great renewal movement in Germany seeks to do in its war against the trader race which controls all the stock exchanges today and determines the actions of almost all those who govern.

The historical development of the great struggles in China begin with the compulsory importation of opium. The Chinese government very soon recognized the harmfulness of this product and, by 1729, forbade the smoking of opium or its cultivation. These prohibitions were made more severe again and again but this effort by the Chinese goverment encountered the resistance of the English East India Company. The proceeds from the sale of opium were in fact intended to bring order to the wretched finances of the company in India. Behind it were the business minds of the gentlemen of the East India Company. The English state, consistent as always, sustained these efforts with its political power. After he had been defeated, the Emperor Tao Kuang declared:

> "I cannot prevent the import of this poison. Men who seek gain and who are depraved wish, out of greed for profit and sensual desires, to cancel my wish. But nothing will cause me to draw my income from the vice and misery of my people."

The center of the entire English opium trade was Canton. That was the city in which the present day Chinese freedom movement began. Within a short time the proven opium smuggling increased here to 1,700 casks a year. The volume grew when the Chinese government carried out a house search among the English merchants. There, they were able to confiscate no less than 20,000 casks of opium. At the end of the 1830s a great conflict developed between the British government and China. English cannons had to be used to protect the opium smugglers. China was conquered. The Treaty of Nanking of 1842 established that Hong Kong was to be handed over to England for all time. Canton, Amoy, Nigpo, Fuchow and Shanghai had to be opened up to British trade. In addition, China was forced to pay 21 million dollars in war reparations. Apart from this, England sold Chinese smugglers' ships the right to fly the British flag.

These conditions sharpened further. In the year 1856 the Second Opium War began; this time with the participation of France. The ensuing Treaty of Tientsin humiliated China and justified the Opium War completely for the allies. This crippling of China in the interests of the *Volk*-destructive capitalist system had necessarily and in accordance with Nature, to lead to the increasing tension, and today we face the great explosion.

It is not easy even for an expert on these conditions to evaluate all the forces which interplay with one another in conflict today according to their value and their arms. Recognized experts contradict each other on very important points concerning a judgement of the different Chinese parties and personalities. That is only too natural, since the true driving force of the leading men cannot be interpreted directly.

Two points seem here to be just as important as were hitherto too little heeded or not all. Since the end of the world war we have seen the almost total victory of international finance which is almost completely Jewish-controlled. The policy of the possessors of this capital is directed toward controlling the still independent island of Japan and its high finance. The meeting at Washington in the year 1921 obligated Japan to give back its conquests in both the Russo-Japanese and the world war. Additionally that document compelled Japan to restrict the armament and size of its fleet.

In order to gain complete control of Japan, it was necessary to secure China as a military deployment area. This could be attained either directly with help of English-American influences—i.e. cannons—or with the help of paid Chinese troops in the service of high finance. We come here to a fact extremely important for present day world politics.

Before and during the world war Jewish high finance had declared that its policy coincided with the policy of Great Britain. England had conquered South Africa for the Jewish diamond dealers such as Lewis, Beith, Lewisohn, etc. It had handed over control of all financial transactions to Jewish bankers such as Rothschild, Montague, Cassell, Lazards, etc. It had allowed the opium trade to fall increasingly into Jewish hands. The Jew Lord Reading whose real name was Isaacs took care of important loan negotiations with the U.S.A. Finally, England, through the Balfour Declaration, took over the safe-guarding of Jewish interests in all states. The *Frankfurter Zeitung* knew exactly at the time what it was saying when it declared that the Balfour Declaration had been the "yeast of English victory." Although Jewish finance capital had come to weigh heavily on English life, the Conservative forces were at least strong enough to take an active role in all lands against Bolshevism through strong anti-Communist propaganda. Jewry now provided the answer, although not directly in England itself. Outside Great Britain this answer was the Communist incitement all over the world against England. Furthermore, the Jewish press initially gave complete support to the Chinese south. The international Jewish press next called for an anti-colonial congress in Brussels in March, 1927. It then began whipping up all colonial peoples in

the east, first the Indians, then the Chinese. This entire action whose outward effects we can follow daily in the Democratic and Bolshevist press, has openly the one purpose of forcing England into more and more concessions to universal Jewry. On the other hand it also has the goal of carrying through with help of the Chinese generals the anti-Japanese deployment in China. Then it plans to subject rebellious Japan which is still independent of high finance.

Japan is itself naturally clear about the backgrounds of the policy both of Moscow and of international finance. Out of an instinct for self-preservation Japan must strengthen its Manchurian forces although not to such an extent that they become independent of Japan. Japan's officers had earlier provided the Chinese North Army with all the modern technical innovations. Completely irrespective of how the situation may develop in the future, Japan must stake everything on promoting a division of power in China.

As far as the Cantonese movement is concerned, it was led by a party which calls itself Kuomintang, which is much the same thing as a National *Reich* Party. Canton was the central point where China had to feel the power of modern colonial imperialism most painfully. Here national-revolutionary Chinese energy had its greatest effect. It goes back to Dr. Sun Yat-Sen who was thoroughly schooled in European national ideas. He was the actual founder of the Kuomintang party. Sun Yat-Sen has written down his ideas and his principles. There is little doubt that he wished to overthrow China's ancient traditions in order to initiate a national renewal. He especially wished to eliminate every external interference. He alludes penetratingly in his speeches to the fact that nothing hastens the decline of a country more than the economic repression of a nation. Such represssion was practiced by the Anglo-Saxon nations, and here he particularly singles out the Jewish spirit. But Sun Yat-Sen committed a catastrophic error in his assessment of Soviet Russia. In it he saw the State which had appeared "at the moment of supreme danger," in order to "fight against injustice in the world." China has to thank this uncritical defence of Bolshevist power for its terrible years since Sun Yat-Sen's death. This pro-Bolshevist policy was continued after his death until the healthy soil-linked interests of the Chinese were able to oppose energetically this destructive effect without the danger of these revolutionaries being banished from the great trading cities.

As teachers gathered around Sun Yat-Sen, a Chinese intelligentsia educated in Europe and America made themselves familar with a foreign world of thought. They returned as a national revolutionary group to their

fatherland. But if the Jewish world press could scarcely contain itself out of sheer rapture over the Cantonese leaders, then we must recall at once that these national, revolutionary intellectuals were no longer regarded as true native-born Chinese. Many had cast aside an old tradition and had come over to non-Chinese ideas about "Democracy," sovereignty of the people and the like. These ideas they had learned in Europe and America. In a certain sense they resembled the Russian liberals who had released themselves from the old Russian forms in order to then introduce a Democratic revolution which was not even rooted in the nation. Finally they were pushed aside by the forces of the chaos they had stirred up. Something similar is also in preparation in China. It is clear that, at the moment when the inner discords of the South became stronger, the position of the Jewish-capitalist powers improved. Loans and pledges, railways, etc., are other ways to render an opponent brittle, especially an opponent who is financially poor and whose army cannot be sufficiently cared for over a long period. In spite of all evident appearances of corruption the attempts at a nationalization of China are admirable. How they will end, no one can foresee.

In the China conflict the European states also show a noticeable uncertainty as they have in other colonial uprisings. This is all the more understandable since even in London itself diverse forces struggle with one another. The still unbroken national will of the English is linked with British trading imperialism. It is opposed to the methods and often the interests of Jewish finance capital. These forces work strongly on English foreign policy, and Jewry has naturally not delayed setting firm policy where possible within the Conservative party.

The question now arises for us, both as Germans as well as members of the white race generally: what position do we adopt in regard to China?

The Briton of old was less rigid in his ideas of State than the European on the Continent. He could afford this loose life-form because he was the inhabitant of an island. However, he has never been a "shopkeeper." The Englishman, Germain, was therefore right when he declared: "The world-conquering Englishman who, glittering in his virtues and terrible in his passions, rough and brave simultaneously, raises his hand and . . . erects a world empire as a creative master people." This mastery still exists today, even if greatly eroded by the City.

In judging British policy and its future colonial activity, the racial materials of these colonies and realms are of interest and decisive. China has just been dealt with. Trading imperialism in its attitude to this ancient cultured people has been disastrous for both parties. Definite demands

result in an organic future, but we will see more of this later. Things stand completely otherwise, however, with India, Egypt, Syria and South Africa.

Every European sees in Old India a land of his dreams. In the midst of a time of technical dehumanization, some of the best of us have become immersed in the ideas of Jajnavalkyas and Cankara. Some are enraptured by the hero Rama, the God Krishna or the Poet Kalidasa. As a consequence, these Indian seekers preached Europe's salvation through the ideas of old India. They did not even notice that this Aryan India had once perished from the ideas of the later Upanishads with their endless widening of the heart. A completely different phenomenon could be observed which already reveals world-political consequences: the inflaming of Indian Nationalism against the national-conscious European British. In the course of repressions during the victorious march of Western national ideas, many souls in disintegrated India awoke to *Volkish* self-awareness in all expressions of life.

Indians began not only to study the religious books but became enthused again for the heroes Rama and Arshoona. Indians today travel Europe, praise the splendors of their people and demand their freedom. Rabindra Nath Tagore sees the salvation of the world coming from this form of non-violent Indian Nationalism. Gandhi preaches constant passive resistance as a popular movement. Alongside these ideas go more powerful aspirations. "Asceticism could not long suppress Aryan thought," announces to our astonishment the modern Indian preacher Vasvani. "Youth must immerse itself in history, they will then find that great patriots were always creative, dynamic spirits." The history of heroes must be taught to the Indian. "History is still taught in the light of development of the Indian race," says Vasvani.

Here we see a vital feeling much like our Nordic, intruding. It is, however, weakened by the remark that neither skin color nor ancestors, but character, formed the Brahman. Here an entire tragedy is revealed wherein the Indian rises above the rest of the 300 millions of his people. If one wished to describe the history of the Aryans he would have to admit that today the Aryan has vanished except for a few very small traces. He has left behind heroic songs and a profound great philosophy. Later, this thought was carried to extremes, to boundless, junglelike idiocy that promoted a racial chaos. A few reborn Indians, newly inflamed by European impulses of will, may be capable of creating a people from among this dark primal-population. The general community has only a dim

comprehension of such ideas, and probably will not understand until it is actually created. The appeal by the sacred old university of Nalanda with its 3,000 teachers sounds just as melancholy as the proclamation by the Radian Splendor of the India of the "coming time." Immediately after the proclamation of these ideas, one reads from these prophets statements that the ideas of nationality and race are "false idols." The disciplined strength of Aryan-Indian thought and life forms are a product of the Aryan-Nordic race. This influence on Indian philosophy is admittedly enormous, but the racial substance from whose soul once the ideas and State had arisen, has vanished except for a few small fragments. Therefore India recently has produced only the tired Gandhi with his pacifism; not a militant leader embodying a new idea.

Besides this, there is the fact that powerful sections have been torn out of the Indian religious structure by Islamic thought. Solely for the reasons mentioned, these ideas can scarcely be fitted together again. Whoever knows the essence of the Koran and its ramifications for the souls of the Hither-Asiatic peoples will judge that the sub-race alien to Aryan India will be a very faithful tool of Islam. The Indian religion is tolerant to the point of self-dissolution. Islam is fanatical to the point of self-sacrifice.

The Indian asserts that softness is harder than hardness; like Lao-Tse he says: "Be humble and thou wilt be master of mankind." These discourses led to the race perishing ideas. The spiritual greatness of heart degenerated into the most desolate sorcery under alien hands. Everywhere the alien idea has triumphed. Once the will to power reigned supreme. The conflicts between Hindus and Mohammedans which prospered in order to form a common front against England will be whipped up again to commit murder at the moment when the British leave the country. Even if all of the thousand reproaches which the Indian raises against England can be justified, the fact nevertheless remains that England exists as a center of power. It alone prevents a torrent of blood from being shed. Soon it will fall into worse times than have ever prevailed before. Gandhi, Das, Vasvani, etc., were only possible because of a European presence. No one will be more satisfied than us when they and their supporters build places of education for their people, provide doctors, satisfy the hunger of the people and preach reverence for the ancient heroes. But that India needs a master's hand over it is beyond question.

From the Nordic as well as the German viewpoint British rule over India is thus to be supported. We can permit this to occur without any ulterior purposes. We can allow it to happen with the fullest sympathy for the great India of the past and its present teachers. Those attempts must

be rejected which utilize a sentimental rapture over Gandhi, promote an assimilation of India or wish to extend it into an English Dominion. Such an attempt will bring race-mixing and, as a result, also the decline of the Whites. Such a policy was introduced in 1929 by the Labor Party government. Great Britain in its own interests and in those of the White Race must not give way, if it is not to experience a collapse like its predecessors in the conquest of India. Once the Portugese ruled here. They built splendid buildings in Goa and even today these provide the traveler with an intuition into the former political power of this people. Nevertheless, primeval forest and jungle vines have become master over this city. Snakes curl on the flagstones of the ancient palaces. The mixed population number half a million, some of which have light skins while others are the blackest brown. This provides evidence of a human decline. We must not fall into the swamp and fever of India which can engulf our White Blood. We must not slide sub-consciously into this dark, tenacious, but unfruitful, native race.

* * *

Seen outwardly, the Islamic world is split today. In Arabia the most bitter religious feuds rage between different sects. Indians of the kind of the helpless Pacifist Gandhi stretch their arms towards him in the sense of an Indian national brotherhood. Angora has become National-Turkish and refused to continue to play the game of "worldly arm of Mecca." In addition we saw the abolition of the Caliphate through the overthrow of Kemal Pasha. But in spite of this, a violent intellectual mood arises in the Islamic world which is not sufficiently heeded by European nations today. Above all it is not understood in Cairo. Ancient El-Akbar University is actively anti-European and anti-Christian in the modern propagandistic sense. It trains a fanatical youth. From Cairo many thousands of religious works and hundreds of thousands of leaflets are sent all over the world to nourish the Moslem priesthood in Africa and East Asia with hatred. They preach an aggressive spirit of the sharpest kind. Experts declare that a single bookshop in Cairo sends 5,000 works monthly to Java alone. "The battle of Islam has been won. It is only the people we do not yet have in our possession," declares a large Moslem newspaper in Madras as an echo of this recruiting work. "From Sierra Leone on the one and Borneo on the other side we are asked about the beauty of Islam," rejoices another paper in Dakna. In India alone three Koran translations are in circulation, one of which was printed in Calcutta in one year, edition of

20,000 copies. British West Africa today number among 16 million inhabitants has nearly 2 million Moslems. Half of Togo is Moslem and Nigeria is two-thirds Moslem. The Dutch Indies has 36 million Mohammedans among a population of 50 million. Everywhere that racial mixings take place in European colonies, Islam finds enthusiastic adherents among the mixed elements. At the same time it promised the Blacks their freedom through a common struggle against Europe. The Indian Vasvani writes: "I say to you Europeans: be on your guard!" Ancient Indian wisdom says: "Guard yourselves from the tears of the weak!" Already the weak in the East, the Hindus and Mohammedans in India, Egypt, Persia, Algeria and Afghanistan suffer under the rule of the selfish aggressive imperialism of the West. Before this coming purified hatred of the Black races and bastards, led by the fanatical spirit of Mohammed, the white races have more than ever all cause to be on their guard.

England remains in Suez as the protector of Nordic Europe from intrusion by Hither-Asia. Simultaneously, it keeps Islamic power contained within the circumference of Mecca, in India, Egypt and Syria. This is a signal act of European self-preservation. As far as Constantinople is concerned, the Balkan peoples here represent a barrier whose vital interests demand a permanent arming against Turkey. Behind them lies the Ukraine which will not permit an absolute rule of the Turks.

In regard to air power, Gibraltar has lost its importance for Great Britain. Nevertheless it cannot permit France to become master in adjacent Morocco. The necessity has arisen for a closer cooperation between London and Madrid. The necessity of expansion by Italy, which must keep its *Volk*-strength close to the motherland, falls into this realm of vital interests. Italian policy, if it wished to be organic, lies in Tunis, Tripoli and the adjacent several islands. In the west of the Mediterranean there is the necessity of a London-Madrid-Rome alliance which can exist as a complement to a system of Nordic states [Berlin, London, Oslo, Stockholm, Copenhagen, Helsingfors] without hindering the latter in any way.

The British Dominions are becoming more and more independent. However, this does not prevent them from having close relations with England under certain, specified conditions. South Africa must remain in Nordic hands to secure an alternative sea route to India. The laws now directed against Indians will one day also be applied to Blacks, those of mixed-race and the Jews, in order to make possible an organic life in the south of Africa and to create there a fortified stronghold should the black awakening become dangerous.

* * *

This Black awakening is still derided. However it is only short-sighted people who do this. The myth of blood has become alive in another form, under the black skin. It is not only Marcus Garvey who raves about the one-time palaces in Timbuctoo and on the Nile. He has support from thousands of other blacks who have been awakened spiritually.

In spite of many splinter groups black centers working consciously for a new African Kingdom have already been formed spontaneously in many parts of the world. In Ethiopia, in Liberia, in West Africa, this racial movement is in part strengthened through religious ideals for which the blacks have to thank the Christian missionaries, even if only indirectly. A Black God, Black Redeemer and a Black Virgin Mary are already ideas in circulation. More important are the centers of financially strong Negro organizations in America. The most extreme is the Garvey group. The party of Dubois is apparently more moderate. Even more cautious are the declarations of the New Negro League. In 1925 a progressive league was founded to fight against the White race which calls itself the Negro Champion. Dubois stated its aims:

> "However wild and horrible this shameful war was, it will be nothing in comparison to the struggle for freedom which black, yellow and brown mankind will conduct against the white until disrespect, insult and repression have ceased once and for all. The black race will only permit the present treatment to occur for as long as it must, but not a moment longer."

And even more clearly Garvey gave expression to the Black longing:

> "What is right for the Whites is reasonable for the Blacks: namely, freedom and democracy. If the English have England, the French France, the Italians Italy, to which they admittedly possess a right, then the Negroes demand Africa—and they will also be ready to shed blood for the sake of this demand. We will set up laws for all Negro races and a constitution which makes it possible for everyone to shape his own destiny as a free man. . .The bloodiest of all wars will come at the moment when Europe turns its strength against Asia. Then the moment will come for the Black world to seize the sword for the final liberation and reconquest of Africa."

The Blacks at present still do not possess a strong power. The myth of blood has also awakened here and its strength will have swollen enormously within 50 years. Until then Nordic man has to ensure that Blacks no longer exist in his states. Neither can he permit any Yellow men, Mullattos or Jews in his state. This points up the problem of America.

In the United States the racial policy will have world-political effects, in exactly the same way as once the idea of Democracy determined the life of almost all states. North America is the area in which Freemasonic "Human Rights" were first realized. Brother Washington became the archetype of this philosophy. The American declaration of freedom was the model for the *Droits de l'homme* of the Paris revolution. Admittedly in order to further capitalism, the battlecry of "Rights of Man" was heard, and the liberation of the Blacks was accomplished in the southern states.

Today every single American curses this Black liberation. The American liberal is bound and determined to force his ideas on America, for as a State, the antiquated Liberalism thumps the dub of "Freedom" on all citizens even if it must be beaten in with rubber truncheons. The Black question stands at the head of all questions of existence in the U.S.A. If the insane principle of the equality and equal rights of all races and religions is one day finally given up, there is yet hope. Then the necessary conclusions with regard to the Asiatics and Jews will result of themselves. Healthy instinct has almost overcome the democratic doctrine in social life through erection of racial barriers. However, we can not tolerate a policy that permits Blacks to appropriate civilization, open stores, become lawyers, and organize themselves politically. Blacks now guide enormous sums into their common cashboxes. They begin to consciously experience the dream of a black world empire from Cairo to the Cape. It is particularly in this respect that American legislation should intrude, and, with clear aim, introduce a resettlement of the Blacks to Africa. After deprivation of political civil rights, they should begin a planned expulsion, increasing year by year, of Blacks to Central Africa. That would be a beneficial enterprise in the long run because every Black could easily be replaced by a white. The U.S.A. would become much more uniform as a result. If all this does not occur, them the present day 12 million strong blacks will, in a short time, number 50 million. As the troops of Bolshevism they could deliver a decisive blow to white America.

The yellow peril in California has likewise made the race problem a burning issue. It is a world political example of how little a question of law can play a role in race struggles, in fact in an elementary migration of peoples. Japan is overpopulated. It must re-settle people in order not to suffocate. That is its life right. America's white upper stratum has the right of self-preservation and it must preserve its west coast from a yellow flood. The question cannot be solved through the ideas of the dishonorable rule of money, which, thanks to racial discord, builds its bank palaces. The honorless rule of money must, by necessity, strive for world

rule by creating world debt. A racial-organic demarcation on the earth, however, signifies, by necessity, the end of international gold currency. This would result in the end of a Jewish messianism that has nearly been realized through the rule of the world banks. It intends to perfect its ideas in the creation of a Jewish center in Jerusalem. The diplomacy of all peoples must arm its people for the coming confrontation between the United States and Japan. The black man already waits quite consciously for that!

The struggle now revolves around China as a region of military deployment. A new world war will be unavoidable if States are not shaped on the basis of the racial mythos. America must remove the yellow race from the blossoming West. It is a future place for the culture of the Nordic race. This is of vital necessity and it stands above all other paper rights. We also demand the recognition of the racial rights of the cultured Japanese people, but not in America. It results from this that a coming North American Racial State must abandon its possessions in East Asia. The Japanese from California can be resettled there. The American naval base on the Philippines will be reguarded as a way of securing of American trade in East Asia. Simultaneously it could be a base for attack in case of a war. That is certainly necessary from the viewpoint of the cartel-imperialism of today. This is no longer life-important for North America once it has separated its alien racial components and begun to consciously arrange itself in its enormous living space between Atlantic and Pacific. The era of boundless expansion has ended with a world war and with the world rule of money. Today we begin the era of inner concentration which will produce a racially organically sectioned state system. To grasp these ideas consciously and to work for their carrying through all philosophers, historians and statesmen of all peoples are called upon today. The *Volk* idea is falsified today by the international capitalists. In that struggle between the States, every measure, indeed every idea, which can have a settling effect is suppressed.

Contemporary pacifism is revealed as a completely untruthful movement. In fact, pacifism rests on democracy, i.e., in practice on the rule of money. Its prattling about world disarmament is a swindle designed to divert the people from the actual causes of their pustulent wounds. World peace will not come with the disarmament of armies and fleets but with the complete destruction of dishonorable democracy and raceless ideas of the state. Peace will come when we can change the world-economic system which is today undermined by finance in the name of the people. These things have brought about the decline of all states. This decline will

continue if the religion of the blood is not vitally experienced, recognized and realized in life. A consciously Nordic-European-raced America, purified of Blacks and Yellows and Jews, is a thousandfold stronger than an America disintegrated by this alien blood, even if it still possess great colonies and naval strongpoints. England's world policy was possible not only because of its position as an island but because the Saxons and Normans created a united people whose center was racially pure. Today, when in London, the Jews of the City influence policy and provide "proletarian leaders," British policy has already lost its consistency. If England's house is not cleaned, then it will not avoid a catastrophe. And, as a result, the Chinese problem arises anew.

A statesman who has only Nordic-European and Nordic-North American interests in mind will support the battle cry which is directed against the present European and American states: East Asia to the East Asiatics! Japan and China are to be judged differently than India, Africa, etc. They must retain the possibility of at least allowing their peoples to live. It is necessary that there stand at their disposal the entire living space from Manchuria to Indo-China and Malacca along with the adjacent islands. To forbid immigration to North America and Australia to the Yellow races but at the same time to wish to colonize or rule the Far East, is a Capitalist insanity, which begins to avenge itself today in the smouldering revolts in China. It is possible that the misused technology of the Whites still triumphs today. It is possible that the Yellow man is pushed back, throttled. But then he will necessarily turn his face in other directions and will follow the tracks of Ghenghis Khan, Tamerlane and Attila. What Lenin and Trotsky have not achieved in order to bring the forces slumbering in Bolshevism to their final victory will be realized thanks to the world policy of Europe and America. Whether contemporary, disintegrated and, for a long time, powerless Russia can stem the advancing yellow flood of millions is more than questionable. Bismarck's words, "The Yellow men will one day water their camels in the Rhine," may find fulfilment.

The salvation from the abyss, however, lies in exactly the opposite direction than, for example, Spengler sees. It is not the captains of industry and the Caesars who rule over personalityless masses who must affirm destiny. We recognize that this future is already half past. Everywhere powers are born which, out of the decline of the old, already shape a new picture of the world. These forces are "not reversible." These powers of our soul and of our blood are our destiny. This is the striving for world discovery in the 15th and 16th centuries, and after human culture and the world State in the 18th and 19th centuries.

The United States of America, according to the universal agreement of all travellers, is the magnificent land of the future. It has the great task of throwing aside all outworn ideas which date from before its foundation. It can proceed with youthful strength to set up the new idea of the racial State, such as some awakened Americans have already apprehended like Grant and Stoddard. They saw the necessity for the expulsion and resettlement of the Blacks and the Yellow men, the handing over of East Asiatic possessions to Japan, the working toward a Black colonization in Central Africa and the resettlement of the Jews to a region where this entire group can find a place.

The attempts of imperialist powers in the last decades to rule the futhermost corners of the world with cannons and to keep the exploited peoples in order were not signs of strength but a proof of weakness, in the same way that a disproportionately large police force in a state does not show a strong structure but rottenness instead. Europe and America entered East Asia on the pretext that they had to preserve their trade in China thereby saving hundreds of thousands, indeed millions, of jobs at home from collapse. That view is untenable, the only valid conclusion is that they did this with contemporary imperialism's lust for robbery. Such a greatly populated land as China is dependent on the export of its products. No American warships are necessary in order to load tea and spices and to exhange European wares for these products. China signifies, for centuries ahead, a giant market for the chemical and technical products of the West. In order to maintain the possibility of utilizing the riches of its own soul, China will need to conclude trade agreements in its own interests, in order to create work, service and order in its land, and without being forced into this by opium dealers from Calcutta and Bombay. It will naturally know how to defend itself if usurious world bankers wish to regard all cultured peoples as terrain for loans, good enough to drudge to pay interest upon interest. International bankers will attempt to appoint a finance minister to dictate policy for the entire land, in the same way as the Dawes Dictate was introduced into Germany.

The present day debts of states are already regarded like private legal agreements. In spite of the impossibility of fulfilment for many peoples, a rupture of many tribute agreements would easily bring the gravest conflicts with world states, or, more correctly, with the bankers directing these world states. The encroachment into the so-called *Deutsche Reichsbahn* or *Reichsbank* had, until 1933, likewise brought with it grave foreign political developments. Thus the railways, money and the entire

reich bore without justification the name "*Deutsh.*" The only things German about them were the slaves working. The control was in the hands of Frenchmen and Jews.

This situation was untenable in the long run, and, if a release from tension occurred it would be due to an alteration of the world-political situation. The greedy representatives of Democracy alone could cause such a relaxation of tensions. After Germany, one State after another fell into the mesh of that world-political system of robbery. Simultaneously, an awakening also begins. This watchfulness, on the basis of the German revolution of 1933, will necessarily lead to solutions.

It is not an "International private syndicate" (Rathenau): not world economic trading nor trusts laid upon all peoples as the goal and "meaning of world history"; not a raceless league of peoples which has to announce the Nordic-German renewal in European and world-political respects, but a racially determined State system. Our State, our philosophy and our *Volk* stand in symbiotic relationship to one another, not wishing to perish in endless mixing of forms in shapeless chaos, such as is the necessary consequence of former Democratic-Marxist world politics. Our State system was founded on the basis of this organic structure to ensure the political rule of the White race all over the globe.

The idea of a racially based world policy signifies in relation to East Asia its independence. It also suggests the release of other nations from the present system which controls them. These States have been for a long time four-fifths under Jewish control. This new idea of the Nordic West confronts Judaism as the sole dangerous opponent of a raceless Pan Europe, chaotic world justice, and the Volkless Freemasonic world republic. No other idea has any validity. And after this world-political evaluation of the struggling forces there will be yet again a confirmation of the State system alluded to. Its foundation corresponds to the interests of the powers forming Nordic culture and States. There will be a German-Scandinavian block whose goal will be the security of Europe from the Communist flood and the prevention of the formation of a concentrated danger in the East. There will be an alliance of the block with England whose rule over India can likewise only be provided through prevention of Asiatic political power. Despite existing tensions we will give common support to a White racial policy in North America provided that America withdraws its demands for tribute from Germany and England. There will be a military alliance with the leadership of Italy. In the Far East there will be a system of Yellow States which will work with the White race to preserve the important White interests in North America and in Europe. To what extent this racial will can accomplish its goals only the future will reveal.

Germany itself will then finally attain its badly needed living space in Europe for its 100 millions. In respect to metaphysics we will seek the inward creative freedom of our people which is linked to our political independence. Only our durability and the strength of the national concept of honor can provide this independence. Therefore the call for one's own space, for one's own bread, becomes the prerequisite for the achievement of spiritual values and the formation of German character. In the great struggle for existence with honor, freedom and bread, of such a creative nation as Germany, the German people must expect the consideration which has already been granted to less significant nations. The soil must be made free for farming by Germanic farmers. As a result, the possibility of breathing freely arises for the German people who now are pressed together in the narrowest space. And as a result, the foundation will be provided for a new cultural epoch of the Nordic man.

VII. The Essential Unity

A people is lost as a people and is dead, if, in surveying its history and in testing its will-to-the-future, it cannot discover unity. No matter what forms the past may have taken in its course, when a nation arrives at the point of truly denying the allegorical images which stem from its first awakening, then it has denied the roots of its being and of its becoming and it has condemned itself to unfruitfulness. For history is not a development from nothing to something, nor from something insignificant to something great. It is not even the transformation of an essence into something completely different. Rather, the first racial *Volkish* awakening brought about by heroes, gods and poets is the ultimate achievement for all times. This first great supreme mythical achievement cannot, in essence, be perfected. It can merely take on other new forms. The value breathed into a god or hero is what is eternal in good and evil. Homer represented the highest enhancement of what was Greek and guarded this even in decline. Jehovah is the symbol of unbridled Jewry. The belief in Jehovah is the strength of even the lowest Jewish haggler in Poland.

This unity also holds for German history, for its men, its values, for the very old and new mythos, and for the supporting ideas of German *Volkhood*. One form of Odin is dead, i.e., the Odin who was the highest of the many gods who appeared as the embodiment of a generation still given up to natural symbolisms. But Odin as the eternal mirrored image of the

primal spiritual powers of Nordic man lives today as over 5,000 years ago. Hermann Wirth finds traces of decline also in the ancient world of gods and influences of the Eskimo race. This may be so, but does not influence what is actually Germanic. He embodies himself in honor and heroism, in the creation of song and or art, in the protection of law and in the eternal search for wisdom. Odin learned that through the guilt of the gods, through the breaking of the bond to the builders of Valhalla, the race of gods must perish. Despite this decline, he nevertheless commanded Heimdall to summon the Aesir with his horn for the final decisive battle. Dissatisfied, eternally searching, the god wandered through the universe to try to fathom his destiny and the nature of his being. He sacrificed an eye so that he might participate in the deepest wisdom. As an eternal wanderer he is a symbol of the eternally searching and becoming Nordic soul which cannot withdraw self-confidently back to Jehovah and his representatives. The headstrong activity of the will, which, at first, drives so roughly through the Nordic lands in the battle songs about Thor, showed directly at their first appearance the innate, striving, wisdom-seeking, metaphysical side in Odin the Wanderer. But the same spirit is revealed once again with the great, free Ostrogoths and the devout Ulfilas. It is also revealed, in accordance with the times, in the strengthened Knights Order and in the great Nordic-Western mystics as seen in their greatest spirit, Meister Eckehart. When, in Frederick's Prussia, the soul which once gave birth to Odin was revived at Hohenfriedberg and Leuthen, it was also reborn in the soul of the Thomas church cantor, Bach, and in Goethe. From this viewpoint our assertion will appear deeply justified, that a heroic Nordic saga, a Prussian march, a composition by Bach, a sermon by Eckehart, and a monologue by Faust are only varied experiences of one and the same soul. They are creations of the same will. They are eternal powers which were first united under the name Odin and which later gained form in Frederick the Great and Bismarck. As long as these powers are operative, as long as Nordic blood mixes with a Nordic soul and will, Nordic man will be active and work in mystic union. This is the prerequisite of every true-to-type creation.

Only the Mythos and its forms are truly alive. This is the thing for which men are ready to die. When the Franks had left the groves of their ancient homeland and their bodies and souls had become restless, the strength gradually vanished from them to resist the more firmly structured lives of the inhabitants of Gaul. In vain Theodoric sought to convert the King of the Franks, Clovis, to liberated arianism. The Arian 'her-

esy' named after its first teacher, Arius, was based on the idea that Christ, having been created by God, was therefore less divine than God the Father.

Thus Theodoric tried to establish nationalism over the internationalism of Rome. Unfortunately, he was himself overruled by his hysterical wife. The leader of the militarily strongest Germanic tribe thus made the spiritual move over to the Roman camp. To be sure, neither he nor the other Franks thought of giving up their characteristic heroism. They only placed it alongside Christianity in order to fight under the latter's banner for their fame and power (*In hoc signo vinces*). Conditioned through the first step, the Roman mythos then overgrew the ancient Germanic ideas of the blood, so that it was able to take over leadership of the German soul. All wars now took place under the sign of the cross. And when this cross had triumphed everywhere, the struggle began within the converted world against the heretics. The Protestants, on their side, likewise bore the sign of the cross into the field. Then the mythos of the martyr's cross died. The present day churches strive to conceal that fact in the same way the Teutons once concealed the death of the old gods. Today, it is impossible to lead a North European army to war for the Christian cross, not even a Spanish or Italian army. Today men admittedly die for ideas, but none of these representations bears the sign which overcame the "devout" Theodoric. It no longer fills our lives in such a passionate manner that we are ready to give our lives for it. It is dead, and no power will any longer awaken it to life. In order to be able to work effectively for the cross today, the churches are forced to hide behind the ideas and symbols of our newly awakened mythos. But these are actually the signs of a strength whose destruction once "Bonifacius" and Willibald had once planned. The signs of that blood which once created Odin and Baldur, which once produced Meister Eckehart, finally rose to self-consciousness, especially when the words *Altdeutschland* are uttered. Goethe once saw the task of our people in breaking the Roman *Reich* and in founding a new world.

* * *

The thinkers of Hellenic antiquity assumed that sooner or later reason would make possible a complete knowledge of the universe. Late, very late, it then became clear, that it is essentially human to be unable to grasp absolute truth, or even the presupposed meaning of earthly causation. Even if the "absolute truth" were revealed to us, we could neither grasp nor understand this because it would be devoid of space, time and

cause. Nonetheless, the current of longing for the absolute passes increasingly through the souls of men. Identical with hopeful antiquity, contemporary professional philosophers are seriously engaged in the search and hunt for the one eternal truth. They seek this truth in a purely logical manner, by making their deductions from the axioms of understanding. Final judgements are thus grounded fundamentally on one's first assertions. This is logical analysis; the dissection of a mass of ideas and the reduction of abstractions to rational notions. On this level of research, from the side of reason, the one truth constantly confronts seemingly endless error. From this comes the understandable despair of Schopenhauer in his observation of world history. Hence, we find the dedication of Herder as long as he sought for an absolute "plan." Hence, we witness also the boundless striving for the advancement of the missionary Christianization of all peoples, one that will humanize all races and create a uniform mankind. These are its eternal goals. Ideas which are of a purely abstract scholastic type originate in the wish of their creator.

Even today this attitude still dominates our entire philosophizing: Even those thinkers who wish to provide us with a *Volk*-linked outlook on the world see in this desired *Volkish* truth only one part of the Eternal Truth. Thus we move completely on the intellectual-rational-logical plane of our being, as if this were the sole platform of human research. There exists another.

If I place a pea on the outer side of my index finger, reach over with the middle finger and then gently roll the pea, then I have the feeling that I hold two peas. In this and a thousand similar cases truth contradicts appearance. Judgement is therefore referred to visual observation. On the plane of the moral will it is the lie which forms an antithesis to the truth. In all these cases the cultivated German language expresses remarkably wide shades which allude to an ever-new sphere of the ego. The one logical, actively-willed truth always refers in its judgements to something outside itself. For that reason Schopenhauer believed it absolutely necessary to accept the proposition that "inward truth is a contradiction."

The latter is not so, if we, apart from the three antitheses, still grasp the idea of a completely different truth which I will call organic truth and with which this book deals.

The organism of a living creature is, in its shape, an ideal type, that grasps in and of itself the purposefulness of its inner and outer structure and the constituents of its spiritual and mental powers. Shape and pur-

posefulness are thus organically one and the same according to Houston S. Chamberlain.The first reveals what is essential from the aspect of intuitive contemplation. The second reveals the apsects of what is rational perception. What is now essential to recognize and what forms the core of this new outlook on the world and the state in the 20th century, is that organic truth is self-contained and can be discerned from the purposefulness of life-forms. What in the first book formed the antithesis as existence and as being-in-the-world (as *Dasein* and *Sosein*) thus appears deepened and broadened as a universal measuring rod in all domains. Purposefulness signifies the structural arrangement of a living creature. Lack of purpose is disintegration. The means exist to ennoble the shape or to cripple the organism. Considered more deeply, the prevention of natural type-forming constitutes a double sin. It is a sin against nature and a sin against the upward movement of inner powers and values. Organic self-contained truth comprises the logical, the intuitive and the actively-willed planes in a virtually three-dimensional manner. Shape and purposefulness are thereby the tangible criteria, not as part of one eternal truth, but as a part of truth itself.

The logical part of this entire truth is the manipulation of the tools of understanding and reason, as represented by the critique of perception. The intuitive part of the whole truth is revealed in art, fairy tales and religious mythos. The active will works in the closest connection with the intuitive power and is symbolized by moral doctrines and forms of religion. They stand, if they are real, in the service of organic truth. This means they stand in the service of racially-linked *Volkhood*. From the latter they come, to the latter they return. And they all find their decisive character in whether or not they enhance the shape and inner values of this race-*Volkhood*, cultivate it more purposefully and shape it more vitally.

As a result, the primordial conflict between knowing and believing, if not resolved, is taken back to its organic foundation and a new observation is rendered possible. The search for the "one absolute eternal truth" was grasped purely as an affair of knowing, i.e., as an affair of something which was, if not technically, then approximately, attainable. This was fundamentally perverse. The last possible will of a race is already contained in its first religious mythos. The recognition of this fact is the last actual wisdom of man. When Goethe in his wonderfully active way says, "Knowing encourages us to something ever new, never previously there; wisdom on the other hand is a self-remembering." Then, as a result, seen from another side, exactly the same idea is expressed. The self-experienced wisdom-filled study of the world and organic self-

perfection signify the eventful experience of that blood current which binds together the ancient Germanic poets, the great thinkers and artists, the German statesmen and generals. It is the innermost wisdom of life and mythic new experiences of primordial truth-content. If we place Meister Hildebrand near Meister Eckehart and Frederick the Great we see the last possible boundary of our spiritual expansion. If the Baldur and Siegfried mythos appear analogous with the substance of the German soldiers of 1914, and the newly-green world of the Edda after the decline of the old gods signifies for us the rebirth of Germany from the present chaos, then we see the verity of our hypothesis.

The wisest man is he whose personal self-realization lies in the same plane as the life-representation of the great men of Germanic blood. The greatest man of our times will be he, who, out of a most powerful myth-shaping, also renews the souls of millions of those who have been poisoned and led astray. This old, yet new, typical will lays the foundation stone for that which hitherto never was. It has given wings to the longing of all our seekers for a German *Volk* and a real German *Volk* culture. And all this is what is essentially new. It forms the mythos of our century. Its active life prepares to penetrate into the lecture halls of our high schools. It has never been so clearly expressed as here. It is high time for it to appear. So it will appear if all necessary conclusions are to be drawn once and for all. That is our purpose.

* * *

The consequences are of the most significant kind. Goethe's aphorism, "What is fruitful, alone is true," signifies the essence of all that is organic. A new measuring rod, which has never been used, has emerged. In recognition of inner truth we will learn that error, even "sin," can be true in the highest degree—if we make fruitful the rationally motivated, intuitive actively-willed man and enhance his strength as the creator even if he has erred. Upon this rests, for example, the great value also of those natural science hypotheses which later have been revealed as materially incorrect. They have almost always stimulated the researching spirit to new thinking and helped to discover new facts. In short, they have enhanced life. The errors of observation led us to discovery of the diffraction of rays. Here organic truth reaches its hands out anew to the mysticism of Meister Eckehart.

A layman could now conclude from this that free rein is given to lies. This is not at all the case. The lie is vitally connected with a lack of feeling

of honor and courage. Even if every man burdens himself with many lies, no lying German will be able to call himself "good" precisely because lies contradict the innermost character values which alone provide us with value and worth. The lie is thus not only actively willed, but is simultaneously an organic sin. It is the worst enemy of the Nordic race. Whoever abandons himself to it unchecked, perishes inwardly. He also separates himself voluntarily outwardly from the Germanic environment. He will by necessity see association with characterless bastards and Jews. Here we observe an interesting counterpart which can be observed in all other domains.

If the actively-willed organic lie is the death of the Nordic man, then this also signifies the life-element of Jewry. Expressed paradoxically, the constant lie is the "organic" truth of the Jewish anti-race. The fact that the real content of the concept of honor is remote, draws with it a swindle which is often a commandment of religious law. Such is laid down in the Talmud and in the Schulchan-Aruch in a monumentally frank way. That brutal searcher for truth, Schopenhauer, called the Jews the "great masters of lies." Further, they are "a nation of shopkeepers and swindlers," according to Kant. Because this is so, the Jew cannot attain mastery in a state which is supported by enhanced concepts of honor. For exactly the same reason, however, the German cannot really live within the democratic system and be fruitful. Capitalist democracy is built up upon mass swindling and exploitation in great and small things. Either one overcomes it after being poisoned ideally and materially or he perishes without salvation from sins against his organic truth.

A review of life can be represented in manifold ways. At first it occurs in a mythological-mystical manner. Then the clairvoyantly grasped laws of the world and spiritual commandments appear as personalities which possess eternal significance, as long as the race which created them still lives. Therefore Siegfried's life and death are an eternal vital presence (*Dasein*). Therefore the longing for redemption embodied in the *Twilight of the Gods* is necessary recognized consequence of the breaking of an agreement, i.e., it was an offense against organic inner truth. An obligation to practice truth is an eternal feature of the Germanic consciousness of responsibility. German folk tales also reveal the same substance of truth. These stories are timeless and only wait upon ripe, awakened souls, to blossom anew. They can at any time be recast into another form of our world interpretation, that is, into what is comprehensible. This does not signify a development in the sense of progress. Thus it is necessary that the mythic content be revealed in terms of the climate of

opinion of the era, that is, in the mode of representation of the time concerned. A *Weltanschauung* will thus only be "true" when folk tales, legends, mysticism, art and philosophy are mutually interchanged, when they express the same ideas in different manners and when they share inner values of the same kind.

Here the religious cult and public politics, as mythos represented by man himself, join together. To realize this is the goal of the racial cultured ideal of our times. Once the crucifix was able to effect a sudden magnetizing of thousands of men who looked at this symbol. Consciously and subconsciously all associative factors were added—Jesus Christ, the Sermon on the Mount, Golgotha, Resurrection of the faithful—and these were often welded together as deeds in the service of this symbol. Contemporary decay also possesses its symbol: the red flag. This hideous symbol awakens various responses among millions of men: the world brotherhood of the dispossessed, a proletarian state of the future, etc. Everyone who raises the red flag appears as a leader in this domain of the gutter. The old anti-symbols have fallen. Even the black, white and red banner which once fluttered at the head in a thousand battles has been pulled down. The enemies of Germany know what they have done. That the Marxists were able to do this, has robbed the honored flags of 1914 of their inner mythos. But a new symbol has already been raised and struggles with all others: the Swastika. If this symbol is unrolled, then it is the symbol for an old-new mythos. Those who gaze at it think of *Volk* honor and of living space and of the time when, as a symbol of the Nordic wanderers and warriors, it went ahead to Italy and Greece. Then it still appeared hesitantly in the Wars of Liberation, until, after 1918, it became the symbol of a new generation which finally wishes to become one with itself.

The symbol of organic Germanic truth is today indisputedly the black Swastika.

* * *

A clearly descernible undercurrent can today be seen alongside the search for the "one absolute truth." We see a completely different conception of I and Thou, of Ego and World, of Ego and Eternity revealed today. This is the organic relation already mentioned. Leibniz appears to us an intuitive and brightly conscious herald. He stands against the mechanistic atomism of Hobbes. The latter asserted that, from a fitting together of pieces which are not shaped parts, society as a whole arises. It

is opposed to the absolutist doctrine of the presence of abstract eternal laws of form and schemas which make up the individual. Leibniz announced that this linking of the individual and universal is perfected in the individual personality. It is completed formatively in a unique and vital manner. From a mathematical symbolic logic we come to the conception of an unalterable being which is in the act of becoming. We think of a being mysteriously shaping itself. The value of this idea of becoming lies in the conciousness of the possibility of perfection through self-realization. The solution demanded by atomism, mechanism, individualism and universalism is only of academic interest. It is transformed into a forward-striving approximation of oneself. But, as a result, a new morality is founded. The soul does not find any abstract rules on the outside. It does not move toward a goal established outwardly. It thus in no case goes "outside of itself," but "comes to itself."

* * *

We wish now to discuss a completely different version of the "truth" to which we have alluded already. This truth does not signify what is logically correct or false. This truth is personal and is known only intuitively. It refers to what is fruitful or unfruitful; what is subject to personal law or what is free and unfree.

It was Herder who sought a humanist absolute. It was indeed he who gave ever deeper inspiration to the great ideas of Leibniz. He became a teacher for our time. Few were ever his rivals. With Leibniz the soul and the universe still stood facing one another as two completely separated entities. This windowless Monad could be placed among the others only through reciprocal acceptance. The same inner law of self-realization occurs when the Monad reflects on itself. Herder now placed the national community consciousness between self and universe as a life-filling experience. A characteristic value apart from all future laws, is allotted to life. Thus man and *Volk* will stand full-blooded and unique, so that they also embody characteristic values, i.e., as a phenomenon also of moral nature which does not perish in the current of an apparent "progress" but asserts itself as an ideal type. This organic phenomenon is inwardly conditioned through values. It is also characterized through values. It is also characterized through barriers, if one may use this word. One must affirm or deny values as a whole. The compulsion of an abstraction would destroy the type because of its fruitful capacity. Herder mocks the progressives who wish to measure the essence of human shaping with their

enlightened *Kinderwaage*. Herder utters words which belong at the center of our times as happy tidings. "Every nation has its centerpoint of happiness in the same way as every sphere has its center of gravity." Around this mysterious "centerpoint" struggle the following generations. The Romantics universally called the *Volk* spirit the essential of our life. Schleiermacher taught that, "Every man should represent mankind in his own way so that in the fullness of eternity everything will become real which can emanate from its womb." Nietzsche later demanded, with all the passion peculiar to him and from outrage at a narrow schematism, the enhancement of life and the truth in the individual personality. Only that which creates life has virtue. It alone has value. Life says, "Do not follow after me, but after thyself." Ranke declared that if in Europe, once again after Rome, an international principle attempts to attain mastery, then, with primal force, an organic-national principle will arise against it. In another passage he assures us in almost paradoxical manner: "Every epoch is directed to God and its value does not even rest upon that which emanates from it but from its existence itself, in its own self."

That is the other truer current of the real organic search for truth as opposed to the scholastic-mechanist struggle for absolute perception. From the living experience of the middlepoint of rapture comes the fullest self-development. That means, in the language of this book, to serve in love of *Volk* honor from the experienced mythos of the Nordic racial soul.

Is the soul identical to God and immortal? In attempting to answer this question, the logical searcher for truth will weigh all possible reasons of rationality for and against. He will then either resign or prove the yes or no. The belief in the uniqueness of personality, of the Monad, in its God-likeness and indestructibility, is an outstanding feature of the Christian. It is also characteristic of the un-Christian Nordic-Germanic thinker.

There is evidence of a truth which is of more value to us than a mere possible conclusion. There is something in the moral-metaphysical realm which we have recognized in the domain of art. That is the imprint of a true form. Its content cannot be separated. With the abandonment of a form appropriate to us in favor of an apparent eternal absolute truth, we not only do not come closer to this "truth," we even reject any possibility of approaching it. But we have seen that art can only become alive among us when our material existence has become real in life. Our armchair philosophers discover "absolute truth" in the "uniting of the finite with the infinite." The "*Volk* truth" is therefore to be examined to determine whether it represents a better approach to the "sole eternal truth." It is

necessary to adjust one's thinking to a completely different middlepoint than the logical-rational calculation of probability. We seek that "enraptured middlepoint" which Herder taught. That middlepoint arranges things so that we can become "one with ourselves," as Meister Eckehart longed for. There will be a rejection of the scholastic-humanist-classicist schematicism in favor of the organic racial-*Volkish Waltanschauung*.

From the insight that a purely rationalized end result of a formalistic kind is not life-determining but merely represents a means for elucidation, a new relationship begins for the Aryan's belief. Some wish to reinvigorate this faded belief. Others reject this enterprise with reference to its apparent insufficiency. Some declare that so little is known to us about it that nothing can any longer be built upon it. Both views are wrong, because they have falsely posed the essential ideas. What is essential is not a matter of recognition of forms of belief but of the recognition of soul and character values. The time-conditioned external shapes (*Gestalten*) are accompanied by their special life-feeling. The race soul mastered the old questions by suggesting new forms. The shaping powers of will and values of soul remained the same in direction and formation. But by them alone one can read the substance and history of Nordic man. Therefore the noble soul, inner freedom and honor are what remain and condition all the rest, as long as the proper racial blood flows through the millions of northern Europe. The eternal truth therefore means multi-faceted truthfulness.

Here we have reached our conclusion. The windowless Monad of Leibniz confronted the other equally rich personality of Herder and his imitators. The latter sought the *Volkish* mediation. Today, we can add that which made it related; that which impelled it to similar development of inner shape was the community of a blood fused with the soul. This racial-soul formed the all-binding undercurrent of a life totality. This essence of blood-conditioning personality is still capable of forming and cultivating several variations. With a personality composed completely of alien blood the Monad becomes windowless anew. Out of such solitude comes abandonment. No bridge of a true understanding will lead from the Nordic to the Chinese, but even less to a Syrian-African, of bastardized essence. Thus Monad and "mankind" do not function reciprocally with one another but as personality and race.

We see here, drawn into the light of consciousness, one of the physical depravities of our day. We may describe that sickness as follows: Relativity of the universe. Individualism is recognized to be just as relative as boundless Universalism. *Weltanschauung* comes into its own right, as if

it had broken a new path. Mechanistic Individualism and schematic Universalism wished to lay the world in chains. The systematizers of philosophy have passed without feeling or instinct over evidence of Nordic existence because the substance of this actively willed urge did not represent a logical system. It only signified an overflowing of soul. Today, in the midst of the collapsing atomist epoch, this truly organic *Weltanschauung* offers more than it did earlier. It demands its right—its master's right. From the center of honor as our supreme value, we must experience a new center of life. Our spirit fearlessly shapes life anew, uplifting it with a genial upward flight.

* * *

The individualistic doctrine which teaches that the individual creature exists of himself has collapsed. Mankind, it was taught, is ultimately formed through the fitting-together of the individual peoples. The remarkable truth is that universalism is a twin brother of individualism. The fact is that Universalism suffers from the same sickness as its apparent opponent, individualism. Both are academic and are alienated from nature. The Universalist school of O. Spann has successfully refuted idiotic materialist individualism. But it fell into the same error from which individualism was born. A purely abstract stepladder to the spiritual realm was created. Systematically, a new construction of the world-picture was begun on the basis of the old Platonic assertion that Genus (Species) comes before Type. It consequently set up a spiritual graduation of historical human society; Mankind, cultural cycle, cycle of peoples, *Volkhood*, Tribalism, Homeland Circle, *Volk*-parts.

We strongly emphasize our view that mankind existed before culture cycles, the latter before the cycle of peoples, etc. We attempt to make this graduation of values. Today it is somewhat suspect. We attempt to make it attractive by declaring that spiritual and intellectual pre-eminence does not necessarily follow a uniform and special classification. Our ideas are expressed richly through our *Volk*dom while culture-cycle and mankind appear paler and less palpable. Here we see the great rupture in the universalist mode of observation. It holds firm to the purely intellectual order of rank. It pursues a new scholasticism throughout. Simultaneously it would like to fit into the biological mode of observation. It established an undesirable priority: "International Church comes before Volkish Church." It also holds that religion comes before the state. We believe that the state admittedly rules as the highest institution over the special

institution called "church." Internationalism finds its spiritual fulfillment in religion, in the church itself, and in the religion arranged and formed by the church. There exists no other supreme value. As a result, the universalist school reveals that it bears its name not from purely professional philosophical reasons but from theocratic conviction. But it also unveils what is actually to be understood by the term "abundance of special-classification": Final diffusion. Is *Volk* to be the third-rank priority without organic ancestry?

If Oswald Spengler wished to construct the history of forms (Morphology) as remarkable "cultural cycles" descending from an abstract heaven, as first given facts, then Othmar Spann is the modern spokesman of the scholastic Middle Ages watered down. We set up the following biological classification priority: 1. Race Soul, 2. Volkhood, 3. Personality, 4. Culture Cycle.

The race soul is not touchable. Nevertheless, it is represented and crowned by the blood linked *Volkhood*. Symbolically it is concentrated in the great personalities who worked creatively to produce a culture-cycle which in its turn is borne by race and race soul. This totality is not only spirit. It is both spirit and will. Thus it is a life-totality. The constituent of the *Volk*hood is organically guided back to its primal blood-soul basis, not to some inessential culture cycle or bloodless combinations of mankind. We cannot see how the rich *Volk* culture could unfold in a raceless, soulless state or culture.

The organic philosophy of our times has withdrawn from the tyranny of rational systems. It is repelled by purely schematic spiritual casing. Once, it was believed that rationalism could capture the soul of races and peoples. By conscious or subconscious intention, rationalism moves us toward some kind of "ultimate totality." Spann asserted against traditional Greek wisdom which claimed that God is the measure of all things and that true religion is found only in the Catholic church. He held that no other truth exists. The outlook has been unmasked that holds onto the assertion that the priest is the measure of all things. Opposed to this is the newly born *Weltanschauung* of our times which declares: the racially-linked soul is the measure of all our ideas, our striving will and actions, the final measuring rod of our values. As a result, collapse, once and for all, will come to both materialistic, raceless individualism and to nature-alienated universalism. They will perish in all their varieties. So also will Roman theocracy or Freemasonic humanitas fall. The entire "universal" aesthetics of the last two centuries will perish. We must clear away the bloodless, intellectual rubbish heap of schematic systems. A single trans-

formation which is decisive for all of our spiritual conduct has been completed. We forget what is inessential. A new sparkling magnificent life-filled center of our existence has burst into enraptured effectiveness.

* * *

This new yet ancient mythos of blood, whose countless falsifications we experience, was threatened. In the back of the isolated nation, dark satanic forces became active. They subvented the victorious armies of 1914. Once again a time came when the Fenris wolf broke his chains. He passed over a world with the stench of decomposition. The Midgard serpent whipped up the ocean. The millions could only be prepared for sacrifical death by one slogan. This slogan was called the honor of the *Volk* and its freedom. The world conflagration came to its end. Nameless sacrifices were demanded and made by all. We soon discovered that the demonic forces had triumphed over the godlike by striking the army in the back. More unrestrained than ever they raged, unleashed through the world. They produced new unrest, new conflagrations and new destruction. But at the same time in the bowed souls of the surviving kin of the dead warriors, that mythos of the blood for which the heroes died was renewed, deepened, comprehended and experienced in its most profound ramifications. Today, this inner voice demands fulfillment of the mythos of blood and the mythos of the soul, race and ego, *Volk* and Personality, blood and honor. These virtues must triumph alone and uncompromisingly. They must carry and determine the whole of life. The mythos of the German people demands that the two million dead heroes have not fallen in vain. It demands a world revolution. It no longer suffers any other supreme values alongside it. The personalities must close around the center of the *Volk* and race soul. They must gather around that mysterious center which has emerged from old which was made fruitful by the rhythm of German being and becoming whenever Germany turned towards it. It is that nobility, that freedom of mystic honor-conscious soul which was a previously unwitnessed stream which passed beyond Germany's frontiers as a sacrifice. It did not demand "representation." The individual soul died for freedom and honor of its own choice and for its *Volk*hood. This sacrifice alone can determine the future life-rhythm of the German people and cultivate the new type of German in hard conscious discipline through those who have taught and lived it.

The old yet new mythos already impels and enriches millions of human souls. It speaks today with a thousand tongues. We did not "reach our ultimate development around 1800." We wish, with increased consciousness and fluid will, for the first time as an entire people, to become "one with ourselves" in the manner suggested by Meister Eckehart. Mythos is for hundreds of thousands of souls not something which one notices with learned presumption, as a curiosity in catalogues, but a new awakening of the all-shaping spiritual center. Faust's cry of "Alein, ich will" ("I, alone, will do it!") after passing through the whole of science, is the creed of the new time which wishes a new future and a will which is our destiny. But this will perceives not only the substance of old and new cultures in order to then withdraw. In conscious self-reliance it rejects the supreme values of the cultural-cycles overlaying us. The fact that our researchers remain stationary at the history of forms without themselves being able to shape, shows only that their formative-will is broken. But nothing justifies proclaiming their unfruitfulness as the destiny of the whole. The new mythos and the new type-creating strength which today struggles with us for expression, cannot generally be refuted. They will break a path and create facts.

The present day mythos is exactly as heroic as the figures of the generation living a thousand years ago were. The two million Germans who died all over the world for the idea of *Deutschland* suddenly revealed that they cast aside the entire 19th century. In the hearts of the most simple peasant and the most modest worker the old myth-testing power of the Nordic race soul was just as alive as it was once among the Teutons when they moved over the Alps. In everyday life one overlooks only too often what enormous spiritual strength has become alive in a man when he visualizes himself with a tattered regimental banner. Suddenly, he sees in all the many-hundred-year-old deeds of the regiment a piece of himself and the worlds of his ancestors. The sailor who, standing on the keel of the *Nurnberg*, sank before the eyes of the foe into the sea with the waving German flag in his hand, and the nameless officer of the *Magdeburg* who pocketed the secret code and was drowned with it—these are symbols, myths and types who have been forgotten in the present chaos. Whether we correctly respect the Gothic, the Baroque and the Romantic or not remains irrelevant and unimportant. These were not forms of expression of Nordic blood. What is most important of all is that the blood in general is still present and that this ancient blood-will still lives. The field grey German *Volks* army was the proof of the myth-forming power to

ready men to sacrifice. The present day renewal movement is a sign that many still uncounted millions have begun to understand what the two million dead heroes are. They are the martyrs to a new mythos of life, to a new faith absolutely.

In the place of the ceremonial uniform, the field-grey garb of honor and the solemn steel helmet have appeared. The horrid crucifixes of the Baroque and Rococo times which displayed distorted limbs on all the street corners are being replaced by austere war memorials. Engraved upon them are the names of those men who died as martyrs to the eternal mythos of blood and will. They stand for the highest values of our people and the honor of the German name.

This strength which was sacrificed from 1914-18 now must shape things. It must fight against all the forces which do not wish it to become the first and highest value. It is there. It must no longer be declared absent. It already knows paths which its deluded German opponents will one day have to walk.

The God whom we worship would not be, if our soul and our blood did not exist. The creed of a Meister Eckehart was made to shape our times. Therefore everything which protects, strengthens, and purifies the honor and freedom of this soul is subject matter of our religion, of our law and state. Sacred places are all thoses upon which German heroes have died for these ideas. Sacred are those places where memorial stones and monuments remember them. Sacred are the days when these heroes once fought most passionately for their beliefs. And the sacred hour of the Germans will appear when the symbol of awakening—the flag with the swastika sign of resurgent life—has become the sole prevailing creed of the Reich.

Index

A

Abraham the Holy, 107
Absalom, 28
Achilles, 124, 172, 189, 191
Adam, 179, 394, 396
Adam, Dr., 90, 92, 100
Adamantius, 173
Aeschylus, 12, 16-17, 212
Agamemnon, 187
Ahasverus, 286
Ahriman, 9-10, 70
Ahura Mazda, 5, 9-10, 70, 75, 146
Ajax, 172
Alaric, 39
Albers, Josef, xxiv
Albrich, 112, 263, 283
Alcibiades, 174
Alcuim, 88
Alexander, 83-85, 95, 105, 305, 323, 390
Alexander VI, 97, 113
Aliosha, 251
Allemand, Louis, 48
Amenehet I, 312
Andelot, 51
Anders, Gunther, xxiv
Andokides, 172
Andreyev, 123
Angelico, Fra, 130, 255
Anjou, 51
Anthanasius, 107
Antigonus, 73, 85
Antithenes, 175
Aphrodite, 15, 77, 172, 175, 235
Apollo, 11-12, 15-20, 23, 65, 285
Apollodorus, 25
Aquinas, Thomas of, xxx, 146, 149, 151
Aribo, 114
Aristophanes, 174-75
Aristotle, 20, 149, 175, 195, 301, 305
Arius, 430
Arndt, 120, 338
Arnim, Bettina von, 260
Arnold of Brescia, 112
Arshama, 9
Arshoona, 417
Artemis, 235
Astarte, 28, 77, 317
Atreus, 234
Attila, 424
Augspurg, Anna, 315-16
August, 269
Augustine lviii, 66, 94, 140-41, 243
Augustus, 23, 39
Aurelian, 25

B

Babeuf, 330, 405
Bach, 61, 153, 163, 223, 248, 271, 389, 396, 429

Bachofen, 13-14, 19, 77, 301
Bacon, Roger, lix, 66, 99, 310, 395
Baer, Karl Ernst von, 242
Bakunin, 405
Baldur, 94, 319, 430, 433
Balzac, 193
Barbusse, 273
Baronius, Caesar, 112
Bassermann, Albert xxii
Baumgarten, 397-98
Baumler, 13
Bayazid, ix
Bayern, Ludwig von, 357
Bebel, 274
Beethoven, 60, 153, 156, 162-63, 194-95, 213, 248, 255, 259-60, 262-63, 266, 271, 389, 396
Behm, Joann, 357
Beith, 414
Bellarmin, 102
Benedict IX, 112
Benedict XV, 293, 390
Benoni, 268
Beowulf, 108
Berlioz, Hector, 258-59
Bern, Dietrich von, 33
Bernini, Lorenzo, 228
Berquin, 49, 53
Bessant, Annie, 20
Beza, 49
Bismarck xvi, 56, 77, 159, 195, 292-93, 323-24, 326, 338-40, 343, 385, 396, 424, 429
Blanc, 405
Blucher, 120-21, 338
Bocklin, 183
Boehme, 152
Bollstedt, Albrich von, 78
Boniface VIII, 66, 97, 112, 322, 328
Bonifacius, 95, 129, 236, 430
Borgia, Lucrezia, 310
Bormann, Martin, ix, x
Bott-Bodenhausen, 361
Bra, Ruth, 315
Brandenburg, 327
Brandt, Isabella, 227
Braun, Eva, ix
Brecht, Bertolt, xxiii
Bemer, 102-03
Briconnet, 49
Brors, 397
Brouwer, Adrian, 228
Brunnhilde, 190-91, 263-64
Brutus, x
Bryant, Sir Arthur, xx, xxi
Buber, Martin, 289
Buddenbrooks, Thomas 25
Buddha, 158, 163, 208, 271
Burckhardt, Jacob, 13, 22, 30, 184
Busch, Wilhelm, 268
Buxch, 287

C

Callicles, 21
Calvin, 48-49
Canisus, 395-96
Cankara, 417
Capet, Hugo, 111
Caracalla, 25, 40
Casoli, 49
Cassell, 414
Castor, 172
Carter, xxiv
Catherine the Great, ix, 405
Cathrein, 66, 398
Catilina, 30
Cato, 24
Cats, Jacob, 180
Cervantes, 268
Cezanne, 184
Chaadayev, 61
Chagallo, 183
Chamberlain, Houston S. xviii, xxix, xxxv, xxxviii, xlvi, 40, 60, 204, 333, 347, 393, 432
Chamberlain, Neville, xxv
Chapot, Jean, 50
Charlemagne, 107-08, 111, 178, 327, 328
Charles IX, 52
Chateaubriand, 219
Chinsi, 30
Chonstantius Chlorus, 25
Churchill, xi, xvii
Cisnero, Pater Garcia de, 101
Cladius, 39
Clovis, 429
Coligny, 49, 51-53, 61
Colonna, Vittoria, 156, 310
Conde, 49, 50-53
Confucius, 114, 130, 303, 322, 410, 411
Constantine, 25, 34, 39, 327
Copernicus, 66, 73, 76, 99, 115, 144, 394, 395
Corinth, Louis, 183
Corregio, 202
Couvenhove-Dalergi, 404
Cranach, 266
Crescentius, 112

Crosel, 347
Curie, Madame, 310
Cybele, 28
Czernin, 293

D

D'Abernon, Viscount, xx
Dante, 31-32, 115, 180
Darius, 10
D'Arnande, Michael, 49
Das, 408, 418
David, 28
Da Vinci, 156, 163, 182, 194, 206, 211-12, 228-29
Deak, Istvan, xix, xx, xxii, xxiii, xxiv
Dameter, 12-13, 77
Deussen, 7
Diakonus, 356
Dickens, 266-68
Diderot, 122
Diederich, 253
Diehl, 398
Dietrich, Marlene, xix
Dinitri, 251
Dio Cassius, 25
Dio Chrysotom, 22
Diocletian, 25, 33-34
Diodor, 311
Diomedes, 16
Dionys, 175
Dionysus, 12-13, 17-19, 66
Disraeli, xvii, 181
Dollinger, 88, 90, 105
Donar, 92-93, (Same as Thor, which see)
Donat, J. 66, 395
Donatello, 229
Don Quixote, 162
Doss, 397
Dostoevski, 61, 86, 121-25, 250, 270
Dreyfus, xvii
Du Bourg, 50
Dubois, 408, 421
Duhr, Pater, 397, 399
Duhring, 223
Durer, 181, 212
Duyozana, 82

E

Ebert, 178
Eckehar, Meister, xxix, xxxiv, lix, 71, 76, 114-15, 128-47, 149-54, 163-64, 242, 248, 253, 257, 271, 283, 285, 333, 351, 357, 383-88, 391-92, 396, 429, 430, 433, 438, 442-43
Echidna, 32
Eckermann, 189
Edvarda, 268
Edvart, 269
Eisner, xvii
Elagabalus, 25-26
Elbertskirchen, 316
El Walid, 225
Emerson, 313
Emmerman, 390
Eriphyle, 16
Ermanerick, 244
Ernst, F., 103
Erwin, 228, 230, 270
Erzberger, 293, 295
Eschenacb, Wolfrom von, 220
Esingen, Ulrich von, 194, 219, 270
Etzel, 191
Euphronius, 172
Euripides, 84, 186, 301
Eurydice, 84
Euselbius, 35, 105
Eve, 394
Ewers, Hans, 183
Ezros, 288

F

Farel, William, 49
Faulhaber, Cardinal, 99, 398
Faust, 124, 155, 162, 170, 205, 213, 234, 248, 252, 267, 322, 398, 429, 442
Feininger, Lyonel, xxiv
Fenris, 92, 441
Ferdinand II, 292
Ferrand, 258
Ferris, H. 347
Feverbach, 182
Fichte, 86, 207, 209, 338
Finna, 82
Fischer, K., 204
Flaminius, 171
Flaubert, 259
Ford, 346
Forster, D. 365
Francis I, 47
Francis of Assisi, 78, 114, 270-71
Frantz, Constatin, 294
Frederick II, 39, 117
Frederick III, 396
Frederick the Great, xxxiv, 77, 116-17, 120, 124, 179, 283, 293, 324, 326, 338, 382, 396, 429, 433
Freya, 92, 318, 319
Friebott, 269
Fritzsche, Hans, x
Fulda, Kaiser, 273

G

Gabriel, 137
Gabutius, 52
Galileo, 99, 395
Galbienus, 34
Gandhi, 408, 417-19
Garvey, Marcus, 408, 421
Gaugin, 182-83
Gay, Peter, xix, xxii
Gebhard, 182
Gebirol, 223
George, David Lloyd, xix
Germain, 416
Geta, 25
Geyer, Florian, 357
Gfrorer, 110
Ghenghis-Kahn, 424
Gierke, R., 360-61
Giorgione, 180-81, 185
Giotto, 115
Glan, 268
Glaucus, 16
Gluck, 259, 389
Gneisenau, 120, 322, 338
Gobineau, xviii
Goebbels, ix, xxx
Goering, x, xxix
Goethe, lviii, 15, 37, 61, 66, 78, 108, 128, 139, 141, 153-56, 159, 162-163, 170, 187, 189, 192, 205-08, 212, 214, 221, 229, 231, 239, 241-42, 260, 262-63, 267-68, 270-72, 322, 333, 391-92, 396-99, 429-30, 432-33
Gogh, Vincent van, 182-83
Gorgias, 174
Gorki, 61, 123
Gorres, 13, 307
Gotha, von, 116
Gottfried, 220
Gouges, Olympe de,312
Grant, Madison, 425
Gregor VI, 112
Gregor VII, 110
Gregory, Pope, 94
Gregory the Great, 322
Gregory VII, 152, 322
Gregory VIII, 110
Gretchen, 172, 398
Grimm, Hans, 269
Groos, 254
Grootes, 152
Gropius, Walter, xxiv
Grosz, George, xxii
Gruenwald, 212, 250, 253, 271, 388
Grunwedel, 28-29
Gudrun, 89
Gunther, 264
Gunther, H.F.K., 179

H

Hadrian, 25, 73, 112, 327
Haeckel, Ernst, xv
Hagen, 109, 190
Hals, Franz, 228-29
Hamlet, 162
Hammerstein, 394
Hamsun, 268
Handel, 262, 389
Hannibal, 31
Hansenclever, 272, 274
Harris, xi
Hartmut, 189
Harwood, xiii, xiv
Hassenstein, 59
Hauptmann, 272, 274
Haym, 204
Hector, 189
Hegel, 175, 328-29
Heine, 223, 288
Heindrich I, 1112, 298
Heindrich II, 178
Heindrich III, 113
Helena, 398
Helm, 188-89
Henry, 112
Henry II, 47
Henry the Lion, 327
Henry of Navarre, 52
Hera, 189
Heraclitus, 20
Hercules, 15, 76
Herder, 162, 393, 431, 436-38
Hermes, 12
Herodotus, 207,311
Herzl, 289
Hess, R. xiv, xxiv
Hilarion, 107
Hildebrand, 245, 253, 433
Hille, 252
Hiller, xxii
Himmler, ix, xxv
Hirschfeld. xxii
Hitler, ix, xv, xxiv, xxix-xxx, xlv, lvi, 294, 336
Hobbs, 435
Hodler, 184
Hoensbroech, 399
Hoffmann, H. 397
Hoffmansthal, 274
Hohenheim, von 149-50

Holderlin, 173, 261, 269
Holitscher, 288-89
Holz, 260
Homer, 12, 15-16, 23, 125, 173-74, 187-89, 192, 212, 234, 236, 285, 428
Honenstaufen, 396
Hood, R., 347
Horus, 149, 311
Hotoman, 49
Hrabanus, 92
Hammurabi, 317
Hutten, 49, 356
Hydrias, 172
Hyperion, 261
Hypsipyle, 19

I

Ibanez, 273
Ibsen, 273
Iktinas, 189
Inge, xi
Innocence VIII, 113
Innocence X, 115
Innocent III, 45-47, 322
Isak, 268
Isktar, 317
Isis, 15, 77, 149, 235
Isocrates, 72
Isolde, 238, 246

J

Jacob, 286, 289
Jago, 187, 252
Jajnavalkya, 160, 224, 271, 417
Jason, 15, 18-19
Jean d'Arc, 389
Jehovah, 70-71, 74, 130, 133, 146-47, 149, 380, 389, 394, 428-29
Jessner, xxii
Jesus, xv, xxi, xxxviii, liv, 6, 35-37, 66, 71, 73-74, 80, 90-93, 95, 97, 99-100, 108, 110, 131, 136, 140, 143-47, 149, 156, 181, 183, 203, 205-06, 208, 212, 224, 240-41, 243, 250, 252-53, 270-71, 322, 379-83, 385, 388, 392-93, 435
Joanna of Alexandria, 73
John, Ludwig, xxix, xlvi
John XI, 112
John XII, 112
John XIX, 1121
Johnson, Samuel, 335
Joseph, 288
Judas, 286
Julian the Apostate, 34-35
Julius Caesar, 30
Juvenal, xxvi

K

Kafka, xxiv
Kaiser, xii, 272
Kaisersburg, von, 356
Kalidasa, 9, 417
Kallikrates, 189, 212, 221
Kambe, 412
Kandinsky, xxiv
Kant, xv, lviii, 60-62, 66, 72, 74-75, 78, 117, 132, 142-43, 153, 163, 170, 185, 194, 197-200, 205-07, 209, 244-45, 257-59, 397, 434
Karamosov, Ivan, 251
Karamosov, Mitya, 123
Karl the Great, 292-93
Karna, 82
Keller, G., 266-68
Kellermann, 223
Kemal, Pasha, 419
Kempf, S., 397
Kennedy, xi, xvi
Kerensky, 125
Kirmes, 227
Klabund, 274
Klages, 75
Klee, Paul, xxiv
Kleist, 128
Kleophrades, 172
Kock, E., xxv
Kohn, F. 288-89
Kokoscha, 183
Kollenheyer, 269-70
Konigsberg, 163
Koniev, xiv
Konrad II, 109, 114
Kortner, F. xxii
Kowalewsky, 310
Kramer, H. xxv
Krater, N. 172
Kremers, D., lviii
Kreutzer, R. 259
Krienhilde, 190-91
Krishna, 72, 417
Kuang, Tao, 413
Kulpe, 254
Kun, Bela, xvii
Kunzer, 105

L

Laach, Maria, 101

Lagarde, Paul de, xvii, lvii, lviii, 76, 141, 146, 272, 283, 285, 330-31, 371
Lainez, 104
Lambert, F., 49
Languet, 49
Laokoon, 170
Lao-Tse, 114, 158-60, 162-63, 177, 224, 271, 303, 411, 418
La Palus, 47
Lapouge, de 403
Lasker, 396
Lazard, 414
Leclerc, 49
Leesman, Hilda, xxv
Lefevre, 49
Lehmkuhl, 328
Leibniz, 435-438
Leisar, xxii
Lenau, 260
Lenin, xv, xvii, 125, 405-06, 424
Lenotre, 248
Lenz, 373
Leonardo, 76, 78, 124, 195, 268, 281, 323 395
Lewis, 414
Lewissohn, 414
Liebig, von, 122, 124
Liebniz, 61, 435-36, 438
Lindemann, xi
Lipps, 254
Liszt, Franz, 261
Lizt, F. 67
Lohse, H. xxv
Loki, 319, 375
Lons, M. 267
Lowe, der, 298, 327
Loyola, xliv, 100-04, 147, 283, 322, 392
Lucifer, 157
Lucrezia, 97, 113
Ludendorff, 295
Ludwig, Emil, 390
Ludwig the Pious, 95
Luise, Queen, 120
Luther, xxxiv, lviii, 49, 61, 71, 73, 97, 106-07, 115, 141, 146, 151-53, 203, 223, 241, 244, 270, 296, 323-24, 333, 357, 387, 390, 395-97
Luxemburg, Rosa, 288-89
Lysander, 84

M

Mack, 268
Macrinus, 25
Magnus, Albertus, xxx, 114
Mahler, 223
Mann, Thomas, 251, 272-73
Mansonius, 73
Marcion, 36
Marcks, G., xxiv
Marcus Aurelius, 25, 33, 39
Marees, 182
Margaret of Valois, 52
Margarets, Louise, 269
Mark, 246, 263, 265, 380, 382
Marot, 49
Marozia, 112
Mary, 73, 80, 93, 134, 136-37, 253, 390
Marsiglio of Padua, xliv
Martha, 136
Martial, 25
Martin, Holy, 92
Marx, xv, lx, 70, 288, 328, 340, 396, 405
Masaccio, 229
Maschler, 397
Masistios, 171
Mathilde, 238
Matthew lviii, 380
Maurois, 273
Mayer, C.F., 267
Maximinus, 25
Medea, 19, 301
Mehring, W., xxi
Meisel-Hess, 316
Meister, Wilhelm, 398
Mellitus, 94
Mendelssohn, 223
Menelaus, 173
Menes, 311
Mephistopheles, 252, 286
Mercier, 291
Mericourt, T., 312
Meriot, 48
Merx, 91
Messer, Mackie, xxiii
Meyer, 397
Michelangelo, 156, 163, 179, 180, 192, 211, 229-30, 255, 310
Minutius, Felix, 93
Mohammed, 322
Moholy-Nage, xxiv
Moltke, 56, 324-26
Monius, Dr., 293, 399
Montague, 414
Montmorency, 51
Moor, 252
Moses, 71, 179
Mowrer, xx
Mozart, 262, 389
Muller, Adam, 67, 254

Mussolini, xvi, xlv
Myshkin, 123, 251

N

Napoleon, xii, 95, 120, 312, 323
Naumann, 405
Nehru, 408
Nickel, 398
Nietzsche, xxix, xxxiii, lviii, 13, 162, 259, 331-32, 437
Nikosthenes, 172
Nikulaussohn, 269

O

Odin, 75, 92-94, 129, 146, 319, 375, 386, 396, 428-30 (Same as Wotan, which see)
Odoacer, 39
Offenbach, 181
Okuma, 412
Omphale, 19
Ostara, 95
Otestes, 16
Otto I (the Great), 112-13, 292
Otto III, 113

P

Pagachev, Emelyan, ix
Palacky, Franz, 58-59
Palagyi, Melchior, 75
Pallas Athena, 11-12, 14, 16, 18, 174, 249
Pankhurst, 301
Pansanias, 6, 22
Papen, Franz von, x
Paracelsus, 149-50, 270
Paris, 188, 190
Parsifal, 162, 178
Paul I, 113
Pechstein, 183
Peregrandet, 252
Pericles, 174, 179
Pesch, S., 397
Peter the Great, 60, 405
Pfundersweiler, 398
Phidias, 189, 192, 212, 221
Philip the Younger, 84
Philippus, 25
Philo, 288
Picasso, 182-83
Pinder, 18
Pippin, 88, 111
Pirogaw, Lt., 122
Pius V, 52-53
Pius IX, 66, 105, 292, 295
Pius XI, 295-96, 363, 394
Planck, Karl, 365
Plato, 20-21, 38, 75, 124-25, 146, 149, 174-176, 189, 195, 200
Plutarch, 22, 25, 171
Poincare, 293
Poros, 83
Poseidon, 18
Pouvan, 49
Pozzo, S.J., 230
Prajapati, 301
Praxiteles, 176, 212, 221
Preller, 12
Preuss, Hugo, xxii
Proudhon, 369
Publius, Claudius, 24
Purusha, 301
Pythagoras, 20, 174

Q

Quixote, Don, 162

R

Raabe, 255, 266-68
Radbod, Duke, 88
Rama, 72, 417
Ramses, 311
Ranke, 437
Raphael, 181, 202, 323
Raskolnikov, 250
Rathenau, xx, 288, 345, 370, 396, 426
Reading, 414
Regensburg, von, 34
Reinhardt, 274
Rembrandt, 162-63, 180-81, 193, 195, 212-13, 221, 227-30, 238, 240, 248-50, 271, 323
Rethel, 178
Rhadamanthus, 173
Rhodes, Cecil, xviii
Ricardo, 396
Richard II, 252
Richard III, 187
Ricimer, 39
Ritter, Theodore, 259
Robbe, 252
Rohde, Erwin, 12-13
Roland, 93, 178
Roon, 56
Roosevelt, F., xiii
Roosevelt, T., xviii

Rosenberg, Alfred, ix, xiii-xviii, xxiv-xxxvii, xxix-xlvii
Rosenberg, Hilda, xxv
Rosenberg, Irene, xxv
Rotharis, 358
Rothschild, 288, 414
Rousseau, 53, 77
Roussel, 49
Rubens, 180, 227-29
Rudiger, Margrave, 190-91, 252-53, 265
Russell, M., 347
Ruysbroek, 152

S

Sabazius, 19
Sacho, Hans, 238, 248, 263, 265
Saint Francis, 105, 130, 322, 382
Saint George, 92-94, 388
Saint John, 92-93, 120, 153, 156, 381
Saint Kuemmernis, 93-94
Saint Macarius, 105
Saint Martin, 93-94, 388
Saint Michael, 92
Saint Oswald, 92-94, 388
Saint Paul, xv, xxxiv, xxxviii-xl, xliv, lvii, lviii, 35, 37, 138, 298, 380-81
Saint Pelagia, 92
Saint Peter, 91-92, 104, 109, 380, 387
Saint Stephen, 93
Salisbury, xvii
Sanchez, 328
Sancho Pancha, 177
Sapinsley, B., xxiii
Sappho, 310
Satan, 157
Saul, King, 17
Sayce, 5
Schact, Hjalmar, x
Scharnhorst, 120, 322, 338
Schickedanz, Arno, 286-87
Schiller, xxii, 149, 156, 170, 178, 186, 212, 251-52, 258, 268, 356, 397-98
Schleiermacher, 207, 437
Schlemmer, Oskar, xxiv
Schlosser, Louis, 260
Schmitz, 287
Schnitzler, 223
Schonberg, Arnold, xxiii
Schopenhauer, xv, lviii, 144, 170, 194, 196-209, 211, 217, 228, 241-42, 249, 253, 255, 265, 270, 287, 396, 431, 434
Schubert, 248
Schuchhardt, Karl, 235
Schucking, 365
Schwalbach, 183
Scotus, Duns, 147
Scotus, Erigena, 66
Segius III, 112
Sepp, Johann Nepomuk, 93
Septimus Severus, 25
Sevigne, Madame de, 312
Shaadayev, 123
Shakespeare, 163, 187, 195, 212, 229, 250, 268, 392
Shankara, 9
Shaw, 273
Shylock, 251-52
Siegfried, 76, 89, 190-92, 248, 252-53, 264, 396, 433-34
Signacs, Paul, 183
Silenus, 172, 177, 227
Silesius, Angelus, 152
Sinclair, 273
Skopas, 221
Smerdyakov, 123, 125
Socrates, 38, 125, 174-76
Solomon, David ben, 223, 288
Sorii, 245
Sossima, Stara, 123
Spann, O., 439-40
Spengler, xlvii, 247, 345, 424, 440
Spitzweg, 268
Spurinna, 30
Stauffers, 327
Stein, Reichsfreiherr von, 120-21, 322, 338-39, 352
Steiner, Rudolf, 20
Stephan II, iii
Stephanus, Robert, 48
Sterheim, 272
Stinnis, Hugo, 368
Stilicho, 39
Stocker, 301
Stoddard, Lothrop, 125, 425
Strabo, 25, 311
Strinberg, 273
Strathmann, D., lvii
Stressemann, xx
Strossmeyer, 105
Stylites, Simon, 124-25
Sudermann, 272
Sulla, 24, 30
Sun Yat-Sen, 415
Surya, 75
Suss, 152
Sylvester III, 112
Sylvia the Holy, 107

T

Taft, Robert, xi

Tagore, Robindra, 417
Tamberlane, 424
Tanaquil, 30
Tarquinius Superbus, 27
Tartuffe, 252
Tauler, 152
Taxil, Leo, 107
Telemachus, 173
Teligny, 53
Tertullian, lviii, 97
Tetzel, 97
Thalelaeus, 125
Theodora, 112
Theodoric, 39-40, 429-30
Theodrich, 246
Theognis, 21
Thersites, 173
Theseus, 32
Thetis, 15
Thor, 429 (Same as Donar, which see)
Timur, ix
Tingeltangels, 403
Tintoretto, 182
Titian, 180, 323
Titus, 24
Tolstoy, 77, 124, 382, 405
Trajan, 25
Tristan, 238, 246, 263
Trotsky, 125, 252, 406, 424
Tucholsky, Kurt, xxiii
Turgenev, 123
Twain, xxvi
Thyphon, 32

U

Ulfilas, 429
Uhde, 182
Undset, 269
Unanums, 273
Uranus, 75
Urban VIII, 395
Ute, 245

V

Van Eyck, 179
Varuna, 75
Vasvani, 417-18, 420
Vatinus, 30
Veale, F.J.P., xi
Vechio, Palma, 180
Velasquez, 177, 229
Venus, 92
Vetter, S.J., 397
Victoria, Queen, xii
Vincent, Julian, 102
Virgil, 32
Vishnu, 108
Vitellius, 24, 39
Vitriarius, 48
Volgatius, 30
Vogelweide, von der, 128, 220, 310, 386-87, 396
Volket, J., 204, 254
Volker, 190
Voltaire, 53, 122
Von Siemen, H., 368
Voss, 12

W

Wagner, Adolf, 67
Wagner, Richard, xviii, xxix, 124, 162, 192, 238, 246, 248, 261-65, 268, 271-73, 332
Waldes, Peter, 45
Wakamyia, 412
Wedekind, 272
Wegeler, 266
Weill, Kurt, xxiii
Weizmann, Chaim, xxii
Welcker, 13
Wenis, 385
Werfel, 272
Wernst, 328
Werther, 77, 398
Wesendonck, Mathilde, 192
Wettin, von, 114
Widar, 92
Widukind, 108, 396
Wieland, 281
Wiemer, 398
Wieth-Knudsen, 372
Wilhelm I, 117, 324
Wilhelm II, 323, 330, 338
William I, 56
William of Ockham, xliv
Willignis, 113
Wilson, xix
Winckelmann, 12, 253
Windthorst, 105
Wirth, Hermann, 429
Witasek, 254
Wolf, Robert, 267
Wolff, L. 245
Wolfram, 178, 310
Worike, 266
Wotan, 74, 92, 94, 129, 194, 263, 265, (Same as Odin, which see)
Wscherd, Vicktorin von, 59

X

Xerxes, 171

Y

Yahweh, 149, 288
Yeats-Brown, Francis, xxi
Ymi, 301

Z

Zakynthos, 84
Zarathustra, 271 (Same as Zoroaster, which see)
Zelter, 223
Zeus, 11-13, 15-16, 19-20, 75, 173, 189, 282, 285
Zhukov, xiv
Ziska of Trocnow, 58
Zoroaster, 5, 9-10 (Same as Zarathustra, which see)
Zuekmayer, Carl, xxi
Zuloaga, 177
Zwingli, 71

CB425.R7313
Rosenberg, Alfred,
Myth of the twentie of our age
PJUM ocm09416249
28209200074 0842

DATE DUE

		due 11/4/88
		due 12/17/88
4-22-85		3/2/89
		4/20/89
NOV 22 1985		5/25/91
		9/16/91
NOV 22 1985		11-21-92
AUG 18 1986		8-6-93
MAY 13 1987		
8/10/87		

CB425 .R7313
Rosenberg, Alfred, 1893-1946,
The myth of the twentiet
century

JUNIATA COLLEGE LIBRARY
HUNTINGDON, PA

DEMCO